

Vol. XXIX.

JULY, 1952.

No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN  
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY  
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the  
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

# Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS:** *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

*The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.*

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. A. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell. Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—V. Rev. J. Tevington, O.S.A., P.P., Innisfail, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Editor:

V.Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

# The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

## Contents:

### OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 189

Exhortation of the Pope to the faithful of Rome—Annual day's prayer in honour of Holy Childhood—Our Lady of Perpetual Succour declared Patron of Diocese of Wilcannia—St. Frances X. Cabrini appointed Patron of emigrants.

### THE SUBLIMITY OF FRATERNAL CHARITY,

Rev. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 198

### BISHOP WILLSON, XII,

Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 205

CORRESPONDENCE . . . . . 215

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY . . . Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 223

The Theology of the Mass, VIII.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 237

Grave sin of theft—Rotary Clubs—Confessions of religious sisters in a church.

CANON LAW .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 247

Revalidation of marriage and Catholic upbringing of children—Confessor of exempt religious priest—Disparity of cult: Proofs required to establish nullity of marriage.

LITURGY . . . . . Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 255

Ferial Mass on first-class feast during Lent—Modification of prayers in Requiem Mass—Questions about Forty Hours' Exposition.

HOMILETICS . . . . . Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 262

The Parable of the Talents.

NOTES . . . . . 264

The young Luther.

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . 271

*Moral and Pastoral Theology: A Summary* (Davis); *Quaestiones selectae ex epistolis S. Pauli* (Ceuppens); *On Darlinghurst Hill* (O'Brien); *The Queen's Daughters* (Martindale); *Theologia Biblica: De Incarnatione* (Ceuppens); *Surrender to the Spirit* (Surles); *Synthesis of Sacrifice according to S. Augustine* (Krueger); *The Convent Mirror* (Hoeger); *Marriage and Nuptial Mass* (O'Connor) [p. 214]; *Reproachfully Yours* (Hasley) [p. 261].

**Nihil Obstat :**

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

**Imprimatur :**

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die Julii, 1952.

# Official Documents

## PAPAL ACTS.

*Exhortation of His Holiness to the faithful of Rome*  
(Feb. 10, 1952).

Beloved sons and daughters of Rome: It is from Our very heart that this paternal exhortation goes out to you; from Our heart, which is troubled by two things. On the one side is the prolonged existence of a dangerous condition of affairs in the world, and, on the other hand, a widely prevalent torpor, which prevents many from undertaking that return to Jesus Christ, to the Church, and to Christian living, which We have often pointed out as the only efficacious remedy for the total crisis agitating the world. It is a firm confidence of finding in you the comfort of understanding Our anxiety, and also of finding a strong readiness to act, that has moved Us to open Our mind to you. What you are about to hear to-day is a cry from the lips of your Father and Shepherd. We are speaking to you, because We cannot remain silent and inert in the presence of a world which unthinkingly continues along paths that bring destruction both to the souls and bodies of men, good as well as bad, to civilization itself and the peoples of the world. The consciousness of Our responsibility before God compels Us to try everything, to undertake everything, in order that the human race may be spared such an immense calamity.

To confide to you those anxieties of Ours We have chosen the festival of Our Lady of Lourdes occurring to-morrow. This festival commemorates prodigious apparitions that took place nearly a hundred years ago—apparitions which, in that century of rationalistic disarray and religious depression, were the merciful answer of God and His heavenly Mother to the rebellions of men. The apparitions of Lourdes were an irresistible recall to the supernatural, and that is the first step to a progressive religious recovery. What Christian heart, however tepid and forgetful, can resist the voice of Mary? Surely not the hearts of the Romans, heirs and transmitters, throughout long centuries, both of the faith of the Martyrs and of filial affection towards Mary. Her you invoke in her venerable images with those loving titles of lapidary eloquence: *Salus Populi Romani*, *Portus Romanæ Securitatis*, and with that more recent one: *Madre del Divino Amore*. These are all monuments of Marian piety, and still more they are truly sweet echoes

of a history of interventions of the Blessed Virgin in times of public calamity. There have been calamities which shook the old walls of Rome, but the City always remained safe through the power of Mary.

You are not unaware that perils more extensive and more grave than any plagues or earthquakes of the past are now threatening the present generation. The threat is no less real from the fact that its long threatening has begun to make the peoples of the world almost insensible and apathetic towards it. Perhaps this is the most unfavourable of all symptoms of the interminable but undiminished crisis—a symptom which is alarming to minds open to the reality of facts. Consequently, with the renewal of recourse to the benignity of God and the mercy of Mary, it is necessary that every faithful Christian and every man of good will should re-examine, with a resoluteness worthy of the great moments of human history, how much he can and should personally do, as his contribution to the salvific work of God, coming to the help of a world which is running, as it is to-day, towards destruction.

The persistence of a general condition, which We do not hesitate to call explosive at every moment, has its causes. Its origin is to be sought in the religious lukewarmness of so many people, in the low moral tone of public and private life, in the systematic work of poisoning simple souls—the poison being administered to them after the sense of true liberty has been subjected, as it were, to narcosis. This persistent condition, We say, cannot leave the good immobilized in the same furrow, as inert spectators of a future in which everything will be confusion.

The Holy Year, which brought forth a prodigious efflorescence of Christian life—an efflorescence first shown in the midst of you, in Rome, then all over the globe—must not be regarded as a brilliant but flitting meteor, nor as a momentary understanding that has spent itself. It must be regarded as a first promising step towards the complete restoration of the evangelical spirit, which, besides snatching millions of souls from eternal perdition, is the only means of securing peaceful co-living and fruitful collaboration of the peoples of the world.

Now is the time, beloved children. Now is the time to make the other definitive steps; now is the time to shake off that fatal lethargy; now is the time for all the good, for all those solicitous for the destiny of the world, to come together in serried ranks; now is the time to repeat with the Apostle: "The hour has come to rise from sleep" (Rom. 13: 11), for our salvation is near at hand.

Nothing less than a whole world has to be remade from the foundations; it has to be changed from savage to human, from human to divine, that is to say, according to the heart of God. There comes a call for a change of ways from millions of men, and eyes are turned to the Church of Christ for a steering hand that is good and unique. The church, it is felt, can, as a respector of human liberty, lead such a great enterprise, and her guidance is implored with outspoken words, and even much more with the tears already shed, with the wounds that are still smarting. The imploring voice comes from those who point to the great cemeteries that organized and armed hatred has spread over the continents.

How could We, placed by God—unworthy though We are—as a torch in the darkness, as salt of the earth—how could We, the Shepherd of the Christian flock, refuse such a saving mission? As, on a day now distant, since so it pleased God, We accepted the heavy cross of the Pontificate, so now We submit to the arduous duty of being, as far as Our feeble powers permit, the herald of a better world, willed by God, the banner of which We desire, in the first place, to consign to you, beloved children of Rome. You are more near to Us, you are more specially entrusted to Our care, and for that reason you are set as torches on a stand, as a leaven amongst your brethren, as a city on a mountain. From you it is only right that greater courage and more generous readiness should be expected. Take with noble willingness the holy commission, recognising in it a call of God and a worthy course of life. It is the commission which your Shepherd and Father confides to you. He calls on you to initiate a powerful awakening of thought and of action. This is an awakening which is a duty on all, without evasions of any sort—on clergy and people, on authorities, families, groups, on every single individual. You are being marshalled on the front of a total renewal of Christian life, on the line of defence of moral values. You are being employed in the realization of social justice, in the reconstruction of the Christian order. You are being set to realize a change, such a change that the external countenance of the City of Rome, from apostolic times the centre of the Church, will shortly appear resplendent with sanctity and beauty.

The City of Rome, on which every age has left the impress of glorious achievements—achievements which later became the heritage of the nations—must receive from this century, from the men that populate it to-day, the aureola of promotress of general salvation at a time that

opposing forces are contesting in the world. Such and so great is the hope which Christian peoples have conceived of Rome, and above all they expect *action*.

This is not the moment to discuss or to search for new principles, nor to assign new purposes and aims. Both these and those are already known and fixed in substance, because taught by Christ Himself, clarified by the century-old elaboration of the Church, and adapted to immediate circumstances by the last Popes. They await one thing only: concrete realization.

What good would it do to examine the ways of God and of the spirit, if in practice the paths of perdition were chosen, and the back bent in easy surrender to the scourge of the flesh? What service would it be to know and say that God is our Father and men are our brothers, if every intervention of God in public and private life were an object of fear? What would it profit to debate justice, charity, peace, if the will should be already resolved to avoid sacrifice, if the heart should be determined to shut itself up in icy solitude, and if no one should dare to be the first to break the barriers of hatred—that dividing wall—in order to run and offer a sincere embrace? All this would only make the children of light more guilty. There will be less pardon for them, if they have loved less. It is not with incoherent and inert conduct of that sort that the church at the beginning changed the face of the world, spread rapidly, remained a mighty force for good throughout the centuries, and excited the admiration and the confidence of the peoples of the universe.

Let it be clearly understood, beloved children, that the root of present evils and of other destructive consequences is not, as in pre-Christian times, or as in pagan lands, invincible ignorance of the destiny of man and the royal roads to attain it; at the root lies lethargy of spirit, anemia of the will, coldness of the heart. Men who are diseased in this way seek in self-justification to surround themselves with the old darkness and look for an alibi in new and old errors. It is necessary, therefore, to act on their wills.

Let the action, to which We are calling Pastors and faithful to-day, reflect that of God Himself. Let it be illuminating and unifying, generous and loving. For this purpose, place yourselves before the concrete condition of your and Our City; see that its needs are properly known, that the aims are clear, that the forces available are well calculated, in such wise that the present initial resources are not neglected through

ignorance, nor employed disordinately, nor wasted in secondary activities. Let persons of good will be invited; let them offer themselves spontaneously. Let their law be unconditional allegiance to the person of Jesus Christ and His teachings. Let their self-oblation be humble and obedient; let their work flow as an active element into the great current which God will move and guide through His ministers.

For this end We are inviting Our Venerable Brother, the Cardinal Vicar, to assume the high direction of this regenerating and saving action for the diocese of Rome. We are certain that there shall not be wanting, either in numbers or quality, generous souls who will run at Our call and will set Our desire on its way. There are ardent souls, who are just waiting anxiously to be called; let their impatient eagerness be shown the vast field that has to be broken. Others there are who are sleepy and must be roused to action; others who are timid and must be encouraged; others in a state of disorientation, and they must be guided. Regarding all those persons, there must be a wise marshalling, a sensible judgment in employing them, a rhythm of work corresponding to the urgent needs of defence, of conquest, of positive construction. In this way Rome will re-live her mission throughout the centuries, the mission of being mistress of the nations, not only as she was and is mistress through the chair of truth which God placed in her midst, but through the example of her people renewed in the fervour of faith, in the model goodness of their conduct—a civic population peaceful in the fulfilment of religious and civil duties, and, if it pleases the Lord, prosperous and happy. We are strong in the hope that the powerful awakening, to which We are exhorting you to-day, will go forward without delay, will be tenaciously followed up according to plans (plans that others will explain in detail), and that it will soon be imitated by dioceses near and far, so that it may be granted to Our eyes to see the return to Christ not only of cities but of nations, continents, and the whole human race.

Let the hand, then, be set to the plough: may God, Who wills it so much, move you; may the nobility of the undertaking draw you; may its urgency stimulate you; may the sober fear of the tremendous future that would result from culpable inertia overcome every staggering feebleness and fix every will.

The prayers of the humble and of the little ones, to whom your tenderest cares are directed, will bear you up, likewise, the pains which sufferers accept and offer up. Fecundity will come to your efforts

from the examples and intercession of the Martyrs and Saints who made this soil sacred. The most holy Virgin will bless and multiply the happy success for which We ardently pray. She was always ready to stretch out her protecting hand over her Romans, and We do not doubt that she will now make her maternal protection specially felt by those children, who showed such affectionate piety on the occasion of her recent glorification—children, whose powerful hosannas still sound under these skies of Rome.

Finally, may Our paternal Apostolic Benediction strengthen and sustain you. With effusion of soul We impart it to all of you who are listening, to your families, to your works, and to this eternal City, whose faith from apostolic times was announced in the whole world and whose christian greatness as a lighthouse of truth, of love and of peace belongs to the future and the centuries. Amen.

\* \* \* \*

*Letter to His Eminence Cardinal Peter Fumasoni-Biondi on assigning a day each year for the promotion of the Papal Work of the Holy Childhood by prayer and contributions.*

#### PIUS XII POPE.

Beloved Son, greeting and Apostolic Blessing—The President of the Committee set over the Papal Work of the Holy Childhood, in a recent letter, has presented a humble and earnest petition that, in the same way as a day is assigned each year to the Missions, so also a day should be assigned for this Papal Work, over which he worthily presides. It would be a day of prayer to God for the work and a day of Christian generosity towards it. The proposal was so pleasing to Us, that We decided to invest it with Our special favour and put it into effect. We are very confident that this is an excellent way of making the Papal Work of the Holy Childhood better known and more highly esteemed. There is little doubt that the holding of public prayers and the call for contributions will greatly help the growth of the work. The Holy Childhood is indeed very close to Our heart, for We are well aware that in those regions, into which Missionaries are carrying the name of Christ and Christian worship, there are multitudes of babes and children whose needs are a most important care of the apostolate. The charity, which gathers in those little ones, which rears and educates them in the Catholic way, which cleanses them with the waters of baptism, which teaches them letters and arts, which shapes their lives

to evangelical virtue, which makes them citizens worthy of the Christian name enjoying the good things of Christian civilization—such charity is the laudable programme of the Holy Childhood, a programme which it carries out with laudable endeavour. Hence, if the faithful help this work with prayers and offerings, they will do something which has Our cordial commendation, and which, We trust, will bring down on them an abundance of heavenly graces. Therefore, Beloved Son, convey this desire of Ours to the local Ordinaries in the way you judge best, giving suitable directions on the manner of carrying the proposal into effect.

Meanwhile, as a pledge of heavenly favours and a testimony of Our benevolence, We impart to you, Beloved Son, to those who give their services to this Papal Work and to all and each who shall contribute to this cause, especially on the day which shall be appointed, Our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the fourth day of November, 1950, the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII POPE.

\*

\*

\*

\*

*Apostolic Letter*

whereby our Lady of Perpetual Succour is declared principal heavenly Patron of the diocese of Wilcannia.

PIUS XII POPE

for a perpetual remembrance.

Tossed by the tempests of an adverse world or oppressed by the magnitude of human sin, poor mortals can follow no better way of salvation than that which cries to the heavenly Mother of God and clings with sincere faith to her patronage. Since it is true that all succour is confidently expected from her and equally true that no kind of succour is sought from her in vain, the piety of our forefathers rightly called her "the Virgin of Perpetual Succour". Under this title, We are informed, the Virgin Mother of God is constantly invoked with all the ardour of piety in the diocese of Wilcannia, and under the same title she receives special honour. It is, of course, very proper and conducive to good that this special veneration of the holy Virgin should be cultivated and increased. Hence, Our Venerable Brother, Thomas Martin Fox, the present Bishop of Wilcannia, expressing the desire of all his clergy, has begged Us to graciously declare the Blessed Virgin Mary, under the aforesaid title, chief Patron of the diocese. On Our part, We not only

approve the project but expressly confirm it. Therefore, willingly granting the petition, herewith, after consulting the S. Congregation of Rites, everything having been duly weighed and attentively considered, with certain knowledge and mature deliberation, out of the plenitude of Apostolic power, We appoint and declare the Blessed Virgin Mary of Perpetual Succour Principal Patron of the diocese of Wilcannia, with all the honours and liturgical privileges which belong to the Principal Patrons of countries or regions. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

This We declare and appoint, decreeing that the present letters are and shall remain firm, valid, and perpetually efficacious, obtaining their full and integral effects, giving their plenary favour to those whom they concern or may concern, both now and hereafter, regulating the judgments that shall be made on the subject, making null and void from now onward whatsoever may be otherwise attempted in this matter, by anyone with any authority whatsoever, knowingly or unknowingly.

Given from Castel Gandolfo, under the ring of the Fisherman, on the sixth day of the month of September, 1950, the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

By special mandate of His Holiness for the Cardinal  
of Public Ecclesiastical Affairs,

GILDO BRUGNOLI, *Regent*  
for the expediting of papal diplomas.

\* \* \* \*

### *Apostolic Letter*

whereby St. Frances Xaveria Cabrini is appointed the heavenly Patron  
of all Emigrants.

PIUS XII POPE

for a perpetual remembrance.

In former years and in these present years also, with the spread of disturbance and iniquity, the necessity of obtaining a livelihood and the necessity of escaping from persecutions and imprisonment has forced many to leave their ancestral homes and emigrate to lands beyond the seas. The emigrants sometimes, indeed, grow rich in worldly goods, but they are often thrown into great spiritual dangers; not a few make shipwreck of the patrimony of the faith, and give up the holy practices of their fathers. For such as these a woman arose, like a light of virtue and goodness, in the person of Frances Xaveria Cabrini. She made it her laborious and glorious task to help emigrants spiritually and corpor-

ally. With this view, she founded schools for the children of emigrants in many parts of North, Central and South America. She not only founded schools, but followed up with every sort of charitable work in favour of emigrants, caring for orphans, looking after the sick, visiting prisoners, exhorting those condemned to death. In her many journeys over the sea she frequently calmed storms by her prayers; she always roused and strengthened the courage of the emigrants. Difficulties of transport, even the gravest, she was able to meet and overcome with humility and faith. Thus, in life and after death, in the glory of sanctity, this noble daughter of the Church was and is a shining support to that class of unfortunate people, for she helped them with a charity which, as St. Augustine says, "inclines itself to some, lifts itself up to others, is lenient to some, severe to others, hostile to none, maternal to all" (*De Cath. rud.* XV). Certainly, Frances Xavieria deserves the name that has been given to her: "Mother of Emigrants". By this name, also, she is invoked with effect. Hence, the Institute of Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart (which she founded) and all Emigrants have sent a suppliant petition through Our Venerable Brethren, the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States of America and of the Dominion of Canada, that We should graciously declare St. Frances Xavieria Cabrini the Celestial Patron of all Emigrants. On Our part, We consider it of the utmost importance to provide for the salvation of those who leave their countries, to seek new homes abroad; and consequently We accede very willingly to this request.

Wherefore, after consultation with the Sacred Congregation of Rites, We have attentively considered all the motives, and by the force of these letters We now, with certain knowledge and mature deliberation, out of the fulness of Apostolic power, perpetually appoint and declare St. Frances Xaxeria, Virgin, the Celestial Patron of all Emigrants, with all the honours and liturgical privileges which belong to the principal Patrons of classes. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given from Castel Gandolfo, under the ring of the Fisherman, the eighth day of September, 1950, the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

By special mandate of His Holiness for the Cardinal  
of Public Ecclesiastical Affairs,

GILDO BRUGNOLI, *Regent*  
for the expediting of papal diplomas.

W. LEONARD.

## The Sublimity of Fraternal Charity

The precept of fraternal charity was in substance enjoined by the Law of Moses (Lev., xix. 18; Mt., v. 43), and yet Christ presented it as *His* commandment (John, xv. 12) and as *new*. "A new commandment", He said, "I give unto you: That you love one another as I have loved you" (John, xiii. 30). Not solely by His example in dying for men did He revolutionize charity, but also by His entire revelation of man's relation to God. Thus did He transform the old commandment, infusing into it a new and sublime motive.

What is the distinctive motive of Christian charity? Passing over merely humanitarian considerations, which have no relation to God whatever, religious motives may be found in the natural order. Chief amongst these is the high place man holds in creation, being made after God's image in his spiritual, immortal soul. Many people fail to rise above that view. The Old Law proclaimed a divinely privileged state, but it did not adequately manifest its character nor its universality for mankind. The fulness of God's design for man was revealed by Jesus Christ and His Apostles. Men were called, they taught, to participate in God's life, whose consummation was the sharing of His eternal bliss—seeing and enjoying Him in heaven; and that incomparable lot was offered to all.

Any instructed Catholic, if asked, could state some good, supernatural motive for loving all men as Christ required. Some would reply, because He died for all; others, because all men are capable of receiving sanctifying grace and becoming adopted sons of God; others, because all men are at least potential members of Christ's mystical body; while others might expressly connect the motive with heaven.

All those reasons are right as far as they go, but not all probe to the ultimate motive. This motive is seen if we co-ordinate them, in one sentence, as follows: The human soul is so precious that God the Son became Man to save it, through extreme self-sacrifice, from the loss mankind incurred by sin and to make it possible for every human being to be restored to the exalted condition God had originally appointed, and that on actual restoration to this state a man becomes God's son by adoption and, in a sense, one with Christ, and consequently a co-heir to the destiny rightly belonging to Christ in His human nature, namely, eternal participation in God's blessedness.

The underlying reason, therefore, is not Redemption, but something which Redemption presupposes and shows : the immense value given to souls by their being ordered to the beatific vision. Though not redeemed, the blessed angels are included in the object of fraternal charity on this account, as well as men.

God's infinite beatitude consists in contemplating His own adorable essence, and the greatest boon He could conceivably grant us creatures is admission to the same blessed vision. Elevation to the beatific vision is the pivot of the whole supernatural order ; it is the creature's highest title to nobility, the source of a worth beside which all else is insignificant.

The virtue of charity, then, cannot be fully appreciated except in terms of the bliss of heaven, which it envisages. Notice how consistently St. Thomas relates charity to heaven, in the passages we translate below. Supernatural love, he teaches, is essentially based on God's proffering of union with Himself in the vision to be shared with Him by me and by my neighbour. Love of God and love of neighbour are both explained on that principle by the Angelic Master, as follows : "*Amicitia autem charitatis fundatur super communicatione beatitudinis, quae consistit in Deo essentialiter, sicut in principio, a quo derivatur in omnes, qui sunt beatitudinis capaces; et ideo principaliter et maxime Deus est ex charitate diligendus: ipse enim diligitur sicut beatitudinis causa: proximus autem sicut beatitudinem ab eo simul nobiscum participans*" (II Ilæ, 26, 2).

A citizen invited to live with a king and to share the most exclusive royal rights would no longer be an ordinary citizen, and all loyal subjects would honour him accordingly. That is how the Great King has treated man, but with this important difference, that all the citizens receive the invitation to God's Home. Incidentally, the parable of the invitation to the wedding feast (Mt. xxii, 1-14) uses and expands this very simile as a royal invitation. All men are called to a unity, a oneness, with God which renders them deserving of a religious love and reverence. Christ saw us in the light of heaven ; He loved us because He saw and loved God, and He commanded us to love one another in that manner—"as I have loved you". That, ultimately, is what we mean by loving our neighbour, as ourselves, for the love of God.

Besides the motive of charity, other salient features of the virtue in the teaching of St. Thomas are presented in the passages that follow, all being from the *Secunda Secundae* of the *Summa Theologiae*.

*THE FRIENDSHIP OF CHARITY AND ITS BASIS.*

"Friendship does not consist in goodwill alone. An exchange of affection also is required, for each is a friend of the other. This mutual benevolence is based on a making common in something. Now, man makes common with God insofar as God shares His bliss with us. On this sharing in common a friendship is necessarily established, and in reference to it I Cor., i., ix., says: 'God is faithful: by whom you are called into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord'. The love established on this act of sharing is charity" (23, 1).

*"NOSTRA CONVERSATIO IN COELIS EST".*

"Man has a twofold life. One is exterior, in his corporal and sensibly perceptible nature: and in this respect we have no sharing of life, or common living, with God and the angels. The other is spiritual, in man's intellectual faculties: and in this respect it is possible for us to live with God and with His angels. We do this imperfectly in our present state—as Philip, iii, 20, says: 'We live in heaven'; but this kind of life will be perfected in our homeland, where 'His servants shall serve Him and they shall see His face' (Apoc., xxii, 3, 4). Accordingly, charity is imperfect here, but it will be perfected in heaven" (23, 1 ad 1).

*ANGELS COME WITHIN THE SCOPE OF FRATERNAL CHARITY.*

"The friendship of charity, as has been stated, is based on the sharing of eternal blessedness. In their participation of this, men are in communion with the angels. So Mt. xxii, 30, says that in the resurrection men 'shall be as the angels in heaven'. Clearly, then, the friendship of charity embraces also the angels" (25, 10).

*WE LOVE ENEMIES BECAUSE OF THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO GOD.*

"Friendship with any person is exercised in two ways. *First*, in his own regard; and the object of this is always the friend himself. *Second*, in regard to someone else: for example, one who has a friendship with a particular person loves on that account all those connected with him—his children, his servants, and others in any way belonging to him. Love for a friend may be so great that persons connected with him are loved even though they offend or hate us. In this way, the friendship that is charity extends to enemies, for out of charity we love these in their relationship to God, who is the principal object of charitable friendship" (23, 1 ad 2).

*BEATIFICATION GOD'S CHIEF GIFT: OUR NEIGHBOUR  
IN ITS LIGHT.*

"The reason for charity is one, namely, God's goodness; and there is one imparting of eternal bliss, on which this friendship stands" (23, 5). "God is the principal object of charity; the neighbour is loved out of charity, on God's account" (23, 5 ad 1).

*IRRATIONAL CREATURES, THEREFORE, NOT OBJECTS  
OF CHARITY.*

"Charity is based on the sharing of eternal bliss, and an irrational creature is incapable of this. Therefore, charity towards an irrational creature is impossible. Irrational creatures may, however, be loved out of charity as goods we wish for others, insofar as through charity we wish them to be preserved for the glory of God and the use of man. In this way, also, God loves them out of charity" (25, 3).

*ONE'S BODY IS AN OBJECT OF CHARITY.*

"Our body may be considered under two aspects: first, in its nature; and, second, in the corruption of sin and penalty. By nature our body is not from an evil principle, as the Manicheans falsely say, but from God. Hence we can use it for the service of God, according to Rom., vi, 13: 'Present your members as instruments of justice to God'. Therefore, we ought to love our body with the love of charity wherewith we love God. We ought not to love the corruption of sin and the penal effects in our body, but, on the contrary, to long for their removal" (25, 5).

*A NEIGHBOUR'S SOUL MUST BE PREFERRED BEFORE  
ONE'S BODY.*

"In the constitution of our nature our body is closer to our soul than our neighbour; but in the participation of blessedness the fellowship of a neighbour's soul with our soul is greater than even that of our body" (26, 5 ad 2).

"Fellowship in the full sharing of bliss, which is the motive for loving one's neighbour, is a greater reason for loving than the motive for loving one's own body, which is the reception of bliss by redundancy. Therefore, we should love our neighbour, as far as the salvation of his soul is concerned, more than our body" (26, 5).

*SINNERS ARE LOVED BECAUSE CAPABLE OF  
BLESSEDNESS.*

"In sinners two things should be considered: nature and sin. Because of their God-given nature, sinners are capable of blessedness, and

on the sharing of blessedness charity is based—as has been stated—and, therefore, as far as their nature is concerned sinners must be loved in charity. On the other hand, their sin is against God, and it debars from blessedness. Hence as far as their sin goes all sinners whatsoever are to be hated, even a father or a mother or other near relatives—as is said in Luke, xiv. 26—for what we should hate in sinners is that they are sinners, and what we should love is that they are men, capable of blessedness. To love sinners truly from charity amounts to that” (25, 6).

“As regards friends that are sinners, the benefits of friendship, as the Philosopher says, ought not to be withdrawn from them as long as there is hope of their cure, but rather they should be helped to recover virtue more than to recover money if they had lost it, as virtue is more akin to friendship than money is. If, however, they fall into extreme wickedness and become incurable, the intimacy of friendship ought no longer to be shown them” (25, 6 ad 2).

#### *SCRIPTURE “CURSES” SINNERS WITHOUT BREACH OF CHARITY.*

“The imprecations found in Scripture may be understood in three ways. *First*, in the sense of a prediction and not a wish, so that “*Convertantur peccatores in infernum*” (Ps. ix. 18) would mean “*convertentur*”. *Second*, in the sense of a wish, but so that the wisher’s desire applies not to the punishment men receive, but to the justice of Him who punishes, as is said in Ps. vii. 11: “The just shall rejoice when he shall see revenge”—since even God Himself rejoices not in the loss of sinners (Wis., i. 13) but in His justice, for the Lord is just and hath loved justice (Ps. x 8). *Third*, so that the desire applies to the removal of sin and not to the punishment, namely, that the sins might be destroyed while the men are saved” (25, 6 ad 3).

#### *WHEN BAD COMPANY IS LAUDABLE.*

“The company of sinners is to be avoided by the weak, because these are in danger of being ruined by them. As for the perfect, whose corruption is not feared, it is praiseworthy for these to mix with sinners with the intention of converting them. Thus did the Lord eat and drink with sinners, as Mt. ix. 10, affirms. But associating with sinners to the extent of joining in their sin, is to be avoided by all” (25, 6 ad 5).

#### *HOW ENEMIES ARE INCLUDED IN CHARITY.*

“Love of enemies may be understood in three ways. *Firstly*, love of enemies precisely as enemies: which is perverse and contrary to

charity, for it is to love evil in another. *Secondly*, it may be taken as applying to their nature, but in the mass: and in this way love of enemies is required by charity, namely, that in one's love for God and neighbour one does not exclude one's enemies from that generality of love of neighbour. *Thirdly*, love of enemies may be understood in a special sense, as a particular act of love for an enemy; and charity does not require this absolutely, for it does not require a special act of love for each and every person—which would be impossible—but charity does require it in readiness of mind. This means that a man should have his mind so disposed that he would love an enemy individually if need arose. Actually to fulfill this love of an enemy for God's sake outside of necessity is a matter of perfection in charity; for the greater a man's love for God, the more he loves his neighbour, too, notwithstanding any enmity. It is as though one loved some human being so much that love for him extended to his children, even though these were hostile to oneself" (25, 8).

*THE PRIORITY OF SELF ILLUMINATES THE WHOLE  
MOTIVE OF CHARITY.*

"A man is said to love himself insofar as he loves himself in his spiritual nature, as was said above; and in this way he should love himself more, after God, than anyone else. This is evident from the very motive for loving. As has been said, God is loved as the source of good, and charitable love is founded on this good. Now, a man loves himself from charity insofar as he partakes of that good, but a neighbour is loved insofar as he is a fellow in that good. This fellowship is a motive for loving, because it is a union in regard to God. Unity, however, is better than union. So the fact that a man himself partakes of the divine good is a greater reason for loving than the fact that someone else is his companion in receiving it. That is why in charity a man should love himself more than his neighbour. A sign of such preference is this, that in order to free a neighbour from sin a man ought not to submit to the evil, sin, which excludes from the partaking of bliss" (26, 4).

*ST. PAUL'S DESIRE TO BE ANATHEMA NO EXCEPTION.*

"According to one Gloss, the Apostle had that wish (Rom. ix. 3) not when he was in grace but in his unbelief, and therefore he is not to be imitated in this. Another tenable interpretation, which Chrysostom has in *De Compunctione*, lib. i, is that this does not show that the Apostle loved his neighbour more than God, but that he loved God

more than himself, for he was willing to be deprived of the fruition of God for a time—which belongs to love of self—to procure God's glory in his neighbours—which belongs to loving God" (27, 8).

*THE RESPECTIVE PRIORITIES OF FATHER AND SON—AND WIFE.*

"The degree of love may be measured in two ways. *One way* is from the object: and on this score whatever has more goodness, and more resembles God, should be loved more. In this way one's father is more to be loved than one's son, for we love a father as an originating source, which is a good more eminent and more like God. In the *other way*, the degree of love is estimated on the part of the one who loves; and thus an object is more loved which is more united to oneself. In this manner a son is more lovable than a father, as the Philosopher says in *Ethics*, viii. This follows, firstly, because parents love their children as portion of themselves, whereas a father is not portion of his son, and hence a father's love of his son rather resembles his love of himself. Secondly, because parents know that their children are their own better than children know that the parents are theirs. Thirdly, because a son, as a portion, is nearer to the father than the father, as a source, is to the son. Fourthly, because the parents' love has lasted longer, since a father begins to love his son at once, while the son begins to love the father only as time goes on: but the longer love lasts, the stronger it is—as Eccli., ix. 14, says: "Forsake not an old friend, for the new will not be like to him" (26, 9).

"The greater obligation on the children's side is to honour their parents; on the parents' side, it is to watch and care for their children" (26, 9 ad 1).

"Parents are a more deserving object of love than one's wife, because they are loved as one's originating principle, and as a higher good. But on account of nearness one's wife should be loved more, because a wife is united to a man as one flesh—according to Mt. xix. 6: "Therefore now they are not two but one flesh". Hence a wife is loved more intensely, but the greater respect is due to parents" (26, 11).

*MERCY AND CHARITY.*

"The sum of the Christian religion is said to be mercy, as far as outward works go; but the interior affection of charity, joining us to God, preponderates over love and mercy towards our neighbours" (30, 4 ad 2).

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

## Bishop Willson, XII.

### THE DISPUTE BETWEEN DR. WILLSON AND FATHER THERRY.

(Final Phase: 1853-1858).

*Summary:* Dr. Gregory's report to Rome—Dr. Willson appeals to Father Therry—Dr. Willson goes to Rome—His reply to Gregory—Dr. Polding and Gregory arrive in Rome—S.C. of Propaganda's proposal for settlement—Dr. Willson returns to Hobart (January, 1855)—Father Therry still objects—Letter from Cardinal Barnabo—Intervention of Bishop of Adelaide—Last skirmish—Fourteen year old dispute settled (January 4, 1858)—Bishop's Pastoral Letter.

In March, 1851, the Rev. H. G. Gregory, Vicar-General of Sydney, went to Europe bearing to the Holy See a Report on the Church in Australia. Not satisfied to confine his attention to New South Wales he presented to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda his version of the Hobart Town controversy. The statement was by no means prejudiced in Dr. Willson's favour: neither was it a complete account of the unhappy story. Of Dr. Gregory's intentions the Bishop had received no inkling. But he must have suspected the cause of Rome's renewed interest in his diocese when he opened a pontifical document dated May 12th, 1852, and delivered into his hands on 23rd October. This letter is not amongst the Willson papers; yet, its tone and general import can be inferred from a quotation found elsewhere:—

"The Sacred Congregation writes thus: 'Since the debt was contracted for the good of the Church by him who was in office, and since Your Lordship has received the revenues of that Church, it follows that immediate steps should be taken to meet the debts'."

Three days after the receipt of this advice—perhaps influenced by it—Dr. Willson proposed that the amount due should be estimated by two or four gentlemen; "but to prevent any misunderstanding, I add, it is not my intention to take upon myself the moral responsibility for the payment of any sum not declared to be due by arbitrators, as I did up to the time the Rt. Rev. Bishop Davis visited Hobart".

Just at this time serious illness threatened the Bishop with a total collapse. To ward off such a calamity medical advisers insisted on a prolonged rest from labour and worry. Yielding to pressure from all sides Dr. Willson made up his mind to visit England. Having completed preparations for the voyage he felt it to be a duty to address Father Therry:—

"As all efforts to come to some adjustment concerning St. Joseph's Church

have been in vain, and as I am about to leave the Colony for a time, I shall take the liberty of addressing you with some freedom, but, be assured, with much more sorrow. . . . Bear in mind that I have not written, or caused to be written, either directly or indirectly, for the public press, from the day I landed to this hour one word on this Church business. . . . That although I had been misled by your *written word* that there was no debt on the Church I did, as soon as the amount could be ascertained that was fairly due to you, offer to take upon myself the moral responsibility of paying you every penny of it. (I had no means, as the Church had no available property, to give *legal security*). Moreover, from May, 1845, I also expressed a willingness to charge myself with the £1000 which the present Attorney-General, and five others, that is six competent persons, declared could *not* be proved to be due from those accounts on which you founded your claim".

The Bishop went on to enumerate the vain attempts made by himself and others to reach an agreement. He gave a long list of incidents showing how public meetings and press reports had encouraged well-known enemies of the Church to use the dispute as an excuse for a campaign of bigotry and misrepresentation. Then he concluded:—

"Think not, however, that now the faction has exhausted itself, and you are left, I may say, alone, that I am desirous of keeping alive this contention. No, I would much rather throw a veil over the unhallowed strife that has disgraced religion so long, and bury in utter oblivion all that is past. It would be to me a source of the sweetest consolation could that be accomplished. Then would joy be given to a long afflicted people—by such a reparation being made as sensible and good men (not connected with Van Diemen's Land) should see proper to direct: then would an aged priest find consolation in the company of truthful, sincere, and virtuous men; then would the nauseous flattery heaped upon him by certain persons, who ought to be ashamed of such folly, appear to him, as it does to those not affected by it, baneful and pernicious; then would the remainder of his days be spent in preparing for the change that *must* come soon to him and to me.

"Oh! throw yourself, I conjure you, into the hands of some sensible and learned priest or Bishop and let him guide and advise you as a child; and also leave to some sensible and just man, the entire arrangement of your temporal affairs. Almighty God would bless such disposition, and bring peace at the hour of death.

"As this may be the last time I shall ever address you in this world I must assure you of my entire forgiveness for the pain you have caused me, for the injury (as far as I am personally concerned) you have done my character, either in the press, which has disseminated it over the world, or by associating with those unhappy men I have so often referred to: and I wish from my heart that Almighty God may, in His tender mercy look down on the weakness and frailty you possess, as well as myself, and by His Divine Grace draw you now, at least, to see the danger of strife, and the joy laid up for those who become in His sight 'as little children'."

In the beginning of February, 1853, Bishop Willson boarded the *Wellington*, bound for England. Four months at sea produced the effect hoped for by the doctors: the patient was well on the road to restoration when he set foot once more on his native soil. Nottingham saw him frequently. It was in March, 1854, that he decided to go to Rome: there he arrived on the eve of the Annunciation.

Had the Bishop been summoned to the centre of Christendom to render an account of his stewardship? That is the view hitherto gener-

ally held. It must now be revised: the opening words of Dr. Willson's own Report to the Holy See leave no room for discussion:

"I left my diocese of Hobart Town in February, 1853, for reasons of health and on the advice of the doctors. I was in doubt whether I should ever be able to return to my diocese. However, after my arrival in England such an improvement manifested itself that I intend to leave by the first boat of the season. But before leaving Europe I want to consult the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda about my dispute with the priest Therry... Owing to the kindness of His Excellency the Secretary I was able to see the Report which Dr. Gregory, Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Sydney, had already made to the Holy See on this affair. After reading this Report I think I can, and must, make some observations which will put the matter in a different and truer light".

Busy days followed. With the co-operation of the Rector of the English College the Bishop prepared his own Report which was translated into Italian. There was much coming and going, writing and re-writing. Finally all was in order. In Dr. Willson's diary we read under date 30th May: "Report sent in to Propaganda".<sup>1</sup>

Early in June two more travellers from Australia appeared in the Eternal City: they were Archbishop Polding and Dr. Gregory. Did they add to the pile of literature dealing with the Therry case? Probably. Amongst Dr. Willson's papers there are references at this period to an *amended* Report—the first one he called "monstrous"—from the Sydney Vicar-General, as well as to another from Father Therry himself. The Bishop requested Dr. Polding to come before a competent tribunal so that questions causing friction could be resolved once for all. How did the Archbishop respond? He did not favour such an investigation:

"The Archbishop, now in Rome, declines proceeding with Mr. Therry's affair. Then, who is responsible for Dr. Gregory's Report to Propaganda in which my character as a suffragan of the Archbishop was placed in jeopardy? Dr. Gregory, I presume, represented the Archbishop of Sydney, and acted on behalf of Mr. Therry. He had either authority to do so, or not. If not, how dare he presume to interfere in the manner he did between a Bishop and the Holy See? If he had authority he is now bound to adopt, defend, and stand by his Report—*valeat quantum valere potest*. He has assumed the place of Mr. Therry and, I humbly submit, made the case his own, and ought not to be allowed to retreat. This shifting of responsibility now that an amended Report has reached Propaganda, and throwing it on to Mr. Therry...17,000 miles away, is most unfair, and most unjust towards me, and might be, but for the justice of the Holy See, injurious to religion in Van Diemen's Land".

At this stage we must not be too severe on the Sydney prelates for telling Dr. Willson that they had "washed their hands of the whole affair". They had their own worries and problems, the full account of which would make an interesting chapter in Australian Church history.

On July 14, Dr. Willson retired to Albano there to await a message from Propaganda. Anxiously and with eagerness he opened a letter

<sup>1</sup>Full text of Reports in Hobart *Archives*.

from Cardinal Franzoni on the evening of July 24. This is what he read:

"Careful consideration has been given to the documents covering the Therry dispute which has caused Your Lordship such serious annoyance. You will readily agree that the efforts of this Sacred Congregation should be directed towards ending the dispute as soon as possible, and this can be done if attention is directed to the main point of the whole question.

"Your Lordship has certainly not refused to take over any debt which can be shown to have been rightly incurred. But in order to avoid re-opening the whole question, which might possibly be strung out for many more years, it is necessary to clarify the document of the 2nd July, 1846. This document, which is alleged to have been signed by Your Lordship and Father Therry assumes that the debt in question amounts to three thousand three hundred pounds sterling. The document is quoted in the attached printed pamphlet.

"Will you please indicate whether you accept this document as genuine, and whether you signed it; for, in that case, I take it that Your Lordship is ready to accept this basis for a settlement of the affair. This settlement would also be in accord with the wishes of the Sacred Congregation, which will doubtless be willing to recommend the granting of a special subsidy. Father Therry, however, will be responsible for his own obligations in the matter.

"I pray that God will long preserve you in good health and happiness.

"Dated the 24th July, 1854, from the Office of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, Rome".<sup>2</sup>

Nothing of this nature had the Bishop been expecting: without delay he made known his disappointment to the Cardinal Prefect:—

"The letter addressed to me, by Your Eminence, 24th inst., was duly received by me at Albano.

"Your Eminence will, I trust, pardon me for stating that the desire expressed in this letter that I should subscribe a document by which Father Therry should now receive a sum of £1,000 as offered to him by me in 1846, *solely to allay a scandal which was then afflicting the Church*, has caused me much surprise and much pain.

"However, as I laid the case before the Holy See on arrival in Rome with a determination of bowing to such decision as should be arrived at, I shall, after begging leave once more to make this brief statement as to what I believe in my conscience will be the effect on the minds of the Catholic community in Van Diemen's Land, and the neighbouring colonies, leave the case entirely in the hands of Your Eminence promising to submit to any terms the Holy See shall dictate to me".

The Bishop then proceeds to point out what he considered would be the conclusions drawn from the Cardinal Prefect's decision. A short summary will suffice:

1) The judgment of five Catholic gentlemen who examined the Church accounts, of the Attorney-General, and of the Catholic clergy is declared to be erroneous.

2) The decision of the Catholics to resist the payment of the extra £1,000 was unjust.

3) The Bishop's refusal to acknowledge the claim was founded on error.

---

<sup>2</sup>Letters in Hobart Archives.

4) A small faction will publish the decision as a victory thus causing scandal and injury to the Bishop's character.

5) An intolerable burden would be imposed on a poor diocese.

6) The Catholic public would continue to resist the claim.

"But, perhaps Your Eminence in your kind wish to aid me might be pleased to recommend the Society of the Propagation of the Faith to make a grant for this special purpose. Allow me to observe that I receive a small sum annually from that source which enables me to keep one, two, or sometimes three students at All Hallows College, Ireland, and to assist in occasionally getting priests out to the antipodes—that if the Society were in consequence of any especial grant made at the request of the Holy See to diminish or discontinue the small sum annually allowed, difficulties of great magnitude must inevitably be the consequence".

Having once more declared his readiness to accept "whatever decision Your Eminence shall convey to me", the Bishop concluded:

"I therefore leave unreservedly in Your Eminence's hands my character as Bishop, and the interests of my poor and struggling Church, feeling assured that the Holy See will protect me from the violence of a faction with which I have had to contend for so many years, and which has inflicted the most serious temporal as well as spiritual evils on religion".

Further discussions and correspondence followed. Finally the Bishop received another letter from the Cardinal in these terms:—

"Before Your Lordship sets out again for Australia it is desirable that you should have a written assurance that the Sacred Congregation approves the plan which has been agreed upon *for the sake of peace*. We refer to the proposal that the one thousand pounds sterling which is in dispute shall be paid to Father Therry *provided that the deeds and other records of expenditure are duly handed over*.

"Furthermore the Sacred Congregation has done its utmost in helping to rectify the economic condition of the diocese of Hobarton. It hopes, however, that the Catholics of the diocese especially those to whom interest on loans is due, will also fully co-operate in reaching the same objective. Of course, they will do the cause a great service if they condone some portion of the debt or make donations. In this way they will relieve you, their Bishop, of your crushing anxieties, and allow you in future to devote yourself with greater ease and freedom to the duties of your spiritual rule.

"I pray that God will continue to preserve you in good health and happiness.

"Dated the 5th September, 1854, from the Office of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. Rome".

On January 30, 1855, the Bishop arrived once more in Hobart. Within a few days of his home-coming the terms of settlement agreed on in Rome were offered to Father Therry. Had any instruction been

sent to the priest? Very probably. Amongst the Willson papers there is an undated document headed: "Holy See to Mr. Therry". We are inclined to regard it as a copy, translated, of a letter forwarded or prepared, or suggested about this period. Several "incontrovertible facts"—all in the Bishop's favour—are listed.

Then we read: "The Holy See calls upon you immediately to deliver to the Bishop the legal deeds of the land (for which it appears the sum of £779 was paid in 1847) and further to give such legal transfer of this land as shall secure it to the Bishop of such trustees as he may appoint". There follows a statement of the proposals offered by Dr. Willson, with the final sentence: "Should you however reject them you are nevertheless required by the Holy See to surrender the deeds to the Bishop".

Father Therry, it would seem, ignored Dr. Willson's offer. Writing to him in November of that year the Bishop said:—

"February last I once more consented to charge myself with the burden, and eight months passed over and you did not even vouchsafe to give me any reply. As from the beginning to this moment the offer to pay £3300 did not arise from the justice of your claim to that sum, but solely from myself to purchase peace; and as you have hitherto rejected that offer, it must be quite clear that as no moral obligation ever existed either on my part, or that of the Catholic community, to pay this extra £1000, so no such obligation can now exist. Circumstances have now, happily arisen which will, I doubt not, render it quite unnecessary for me ever again to offer to lay myself under such awful responsibility...

"I may add that whenever a grant of land issues to the trustees I will use my best endeavours to pay you as soon as possible what the community has acknowledged to be due to you: but until then I shall not be disposed to recommend the payment of one farthing...

"Arbitration you have rejected, the advice of the Archbishop, Archdeacon McEncroe, and Bishop Davis you have rejected: with you then rests the sole responsibility of closing the matter or not. The offer of charging myself with the payment of the £1,000, I positively decline; the remainder, on the issuing of a grant, I would bind myself, my successor, or representative in the event of death, by solemn moral obligation to pay...."

Early in 1854 Father Therry returned to Sydney, where he remained until he found it advisable to make peace.

A letter from Cardinal Barnabo, now Prefect of Propaganda, opened the final stage of the controversy. Dated 16th December, 1856, this document reached the Bishop in May, 1857:

"Letters received in July of this year from the Archbishop of Sydney convey the very unpleasant information that the dispute between Your Lordship and the priest Therry had not been settled. It is the most earnest desire of this Sacred Congregation of Propaganda that an end should be put to the aforesaid controversy so that those scandals may be averted which necessarily arise to the serious injury of souls. Therefore I beg Your Lordship again and again in the Lord that because of the pastoral office you hold you would accept the good offices of the Archbishop of Sydney in bringing about complete agreement between yourself and

the priest Therry. Awaiting a reply in harmony with the wishes of this Sacred Council I will pray God to keep and preserve you".

Father Therry received a letter to the same effect; but Dr. Willson was not aware of this. Hence he felt resentful suspecting that he had been represented as blameworthy. Dr. Polding, entrusted with the task of making peace, had merely stated that settlement had not been reached. In the course of a long letter from Hobart the Archbishop was reminded:—

"As I found Your Grace...determined not to submit to an investigation in Congress, for the sake of peace and not for justice—and for another strong reason not at present necessary to mention—I did again consent to renew my offer to Mr. Therry to pay him £3,300 instead of £2,300 on certain conditions...

"With regard to the promise I made when in Rome, July, 1854, it has been reported I am told that the Holy See decided I should be responsible for the £1,000. I beg leave to say there is not one word of truth in such report. The Cardinal Prefect's Letter is now lying before me, in which I am asked, if I would once more *pro bono pacis* (the very term used) consent to offer £1,000...

"I did fulfil my promise as soon as I reached Hobart Town, February, 1855: the offer was made, and a promise to pay as I could by half-yearly instalments, and six per cent. per annum on all unpaid sums on condition of a transfer. To this offer no reply was ever made...

"October,<sup>3</sup> 1855, as my offer had not been accepted of, after waiting full eight months, I gave Mr. Therry notice that I should not hold myself any longer bound by it—and, my Lord Archbishop, never again, whatever may be the result shall I consent to pay even one penny of the £1,000 I offered to charge myself with for the sake of peace, exclusive of the people of Van Diemen's Land. God in His mercy has been pleased to grant peace to His Church without this awful sacrifice...."

Just at this time Bishop Murphy of Adelaide and Bishop Goold of Melbourne decided to pay a visit to Dr. Willson. They arrived in Hobart on May 15.<sup>4</sup> All the letters and documents connected with the Church dispute were placed before them. The two prelates—up to this time somewhat in the dark as to the facts of the case—took action. Of his own accord, on June 16, Bishop Murphy went off to Sydney *via* Melbourne and advised the Archbishop to compel Father Therry to accept terms of settlement. Having opened negotiations, Dr. Murphy wrote:

"Sydney, July 8, 1857.

"My ever dear Lord,

"I saw Father Therry yesterday and only had time to have a very short conversation with him... In the meantime let me know as soon as you possibly can what amount (or if any) you could immediately raise and pay over to Mr. Therry out of the £2,300. Again I wish to know what is the amount of the sums already expended by you on the Church Account, and which are to be deducted from this £2,300. He acknowledges the justice of deducting the £700 paid for the land; but he fears that you will bring large bills against him for law expenses, etc., and thus considerably reduce these 2,300 pounds.

<sup>3</sup>November?

<sup>4</sup>Dates of arrival given by newspapers.

"As you have engaged to pay interest at 6 per cent. for the balance of the debt (£2,300) I would, my dear Lord, sincerely advise you to be as moderate as possible in your demand against him; and even though you should be at a loss by deducting even what is lawfully due to you. I think that this loss may be counter-balanced by prevailing upon Father Therry not to exact payment of the six per cent. which you offer. Father Therry offers to put the Deeds in my hands as a third party. Do, my dear Lord, go as far as you can in this matter, and I will endeavour to prevail upon him to give up the thousand pounds in dispute between you.

"I leave Sydney in the latter end of this month. The Archbishop desires me to say every thing kind to you on his part.

"Believe me, my ever dear Lord, your affectionate brother in Christ,

"+F. Murphy, Bp. of Adelaide".

On July 16 the Bishop of Hobart sent a hastily written note in reply:

"This moment your kind letter of the 8th has just been received.

"To cut the matter short: on a grant being issued to the Trustees of the Church, elected according to the local Church Act, I will consent to sink the ruinous law expenses the Church has incurred in this lamentable business and pay him [Father Therry] in cash two thousand three hundred pounds (£2,300)—less whatever has been paid on the Church account, or received by Mr. Therry in the way of subscriptions.

"The cause of my offering to pay in cash *now* is that a friend will advance me the money at 5 or 4 per cent. I beg leave to add that this offer is only made at this time; I may not be so fortunate as to have the chance again of making it.

"I have not a moment to spare: the Sydney post is closed; but I will try to send this by some passenger in the *City of Hobart*".

In the course of the dispute advantage had been taken at times of phrases capable of being misunderstood or misinterpreted. Dr. Willson would not allow anything of this nature to nullify the success of this final bid for peace.

"In my haste on Thursday I omitted one or two remarks which it might be as well to be made and I am sure you will excuse my doings. Mr. Therry's want of ...consistency makes me dread him; and hence my caution.

"The delivering to Your Lordship, or to any other third party the deeds of the land *without a grant of it issuing in favour of the trustees elected according to the provisions of our Church Act* would be no warranty for me, on the part of the Catholic community to pay Mr. Therry one penny; nor shall I do so. You will find by reference to the little printed pamphlet 'St. Joseph's Church'—printed July, 1849, that at the Caveat Board the land was claimed by J. J. Therry, John Regan, and William Insley. To pay Mr. Therry, therefore, any sum of money until Messrs. Regan and Insley give up their joint claim with Mr. Therry (unjust as though it be) would be an act of folly which would bring on me, deservedly, the strongest disapprobation of the Catholic community....

"There can be no *legal transfer* but by the issuing a grant from the Crown. This, therefore, is a *sine qua non*.

"If the offers made be not accepted of before Tuesday, 1st September, prox., that is, if I do not hear by that day they are accepted of, I shall hold myself fully released therefrom..."

On August 17 the Bishop of Adelaide returned from Sydney to Hobart with written authority to settle the affair. On September 2 Father Therry arrived, having been sent over by Dr. Polding so that the

good Bishop Murphy could have the happy assurance, before leaving for Adelaide, that peace had really come to the long suffering Catholic community. Dr. Willson borrowed the £1,500—balance of the £2,300 still due to Father Therry—and deposited it in the hands of a third party *chosen by the priest*, to be paid to him on the date of the legal transfer of the land for which Father Hall had paid. This transaction took place on September 11th. Dr. Murphy, thinking that all difficulties had been removed, then left for Adelaide.

The news from Hobart brought joy to the Bishop of Melbourne:

"29th September, 1857.

"My ever dear Lord,

"I hasten to offer you my sincere and most hearty congratulations on the, I hope, satisfactory settlement between Your Lordship and Fr. Therry. On my return from the interior our good and amiable friend the Bishop of Adelaide handed me your kind and highly esteemed favour...

"May God in His goodness continue to bless your zeal and that of your clergy, with the same happy success in saving souls, as now distinguishes it. Commending myself and diocese to Your Lordship's prayers, I remain.

"Yours sincerely and affectionately in Xt.

"J. A. Goold,

"Bishop of Melbourne."

But the rejoicing was somewhat premature. "One vexatious obstacle and then another", including unexpected claims by solicitors, threatened to keep the controversy alive. Bishop Goold in a note to Father Hall says:

"So the fair prospects of a satisfactory settlement of the disputed Church property have disappeared. How I feel for my dear friend your good Bishop. It is cruel thus to trifle with his peace, and the peace of the diocese".

And, writing to Dr. Willson, he refers to the Bishop of Adelaide, adding:

"He must feel acutely the little or rather non-success of his pious efforts to move Father Therry to do his duty. You have, indeed, done everything to secure peace".

On hearing rumours that all was not well in Hobart the Bishop of Adelaide wrote: "You have at least the happy consideration that you left nothing undone to restore peace.... During the two distinct visits which I paid Your Lordship during the last few months I was exceedingly edified with the unity and affection existing between yourself and your clergy, and the flock and their pastors, and in beholding the numbers who on every Sunday presented themselves to receive Holy Communion".

Reason and good sense at length prevailed. On January 4, 1858, the fourteen year old controversy came to an end when Father Therry accepted, without any qualification, the terms by this time regarded as

just by all parties concerned. On January 8 the title deed was given to the Bishop.

In a Pastoral letter Dr. Willson told his people: "You are too well aware, unhappily, that some questions regarding temporal matters belonging to St. Joseph's Church, have long delayed a final settlement. The land on which the Church and other buildings stand, has been duly conveyed, by grant from the Crown, to the Trustees elected by you in December last".

"To effect this desirable settlement, I have, relying on your faith, your zeal, and generosity, made myself personally responsible for Fifteen Hundred Pounds (£1500), and £45/12/6, expenses in obtaining the Grant, and for the settlement of this long-pending question. The payment, therefore, of this £1545/12/6 will render the Church, and the whole of the adjoining property, quite free from all debt. The Church being now your undisputable property, let it not stand in debt.

"To you then I am compelled to appeal to assist in relieving me from this heavy burden I have ventured to take upon me".

The Bishop's appeal was not in vain.

JOHN H. CULLEN.

(To be continued).

\* \* \* \*

### SHORT NOTICE.

MARRIAGE AND NUPTIAL MASS, by Rev. B. O'Connor, Melbourne, Advocate Press. pp. 32.

This elegantly printed booklet deserves to be widely known and used. Some very practical ideas are given on Marriage and the Nuptial Mass in a foreword. The Marriage Rite is given in full, which would allow users of this booklet to follow the ceremony exactly. Then follows a translation of the Nuptial Mass itself, with all necessary explanations printed in red. Father O'Connor's little book should become a 'must' for Catholic brides and bridegrooms and their friends at Nuptial Masses.

T.V.

## Correspondence

Dear Rev. Sir,

Gratitude to the author of *Mysterium Fidei*—a goldmine, the treasures of which have been such a help to me in the years of my priesthood, has prompted these comments on statements in the *A.C.R.* by Dr. Muldoon.

(A) He says (*A.C.R.*, October, 1951, Page 325): "At this point we encounter another school of thought headed by Father de la Taille, S.J. This modern school does not hesitate to say that in the Mass *there is no new immolation of Christ the Victim*. They would have us believe that the Mass consists essentially in the mere oblation made by the Church of the bloody immolation of Christ which took place on Calvary two thousand years ago. This oblation of the once immolated Victim formally constitutes the Mass a true Sacrifice".

Now, Fr. de la Taille has not taught any such thing. He even says in *Mysterium Fidei*, Book II, Chapter V, last paragraph: "Though we exclude from the Mass all real immolation induced here and now in Christ we strongly maintain a symbolic immolation of Christ. Hence, if anyone were to exclude from the Mass not only real, but also mystical immolation, we say without hesitation, his teaching would be repugnant to the truth handed on to us by tradition, and to Catholic sense".

Now, Dr. Muldoon may reject the teaching of Fr. de la Taille, he may hold that the mystical immolation is a "real immolation of the sacramental order", but he is not justified in stating that Fr. de la Taille teaches that in the Mass "there is no new immolation of Christ the Victim".

Moreover, Fr. de la Taille says in the same paragraph: "Our offering is involved in the symbolical or mystic immolation which Christ first made and which we renew every day, and consists in the twofold consecration of the bread into His Body, and the wine into His Blood, so that *thereby Christ appears as given over through death to God*, in so far as He is clothed with a sacramental separation of the Body and Blood".

If Dr. Muldoon believes that the mystical immolation is a "real sacramental" immolation, he is, of course, entitled to defend his belief. But also let it be clearly known that Fr. de la Taille teaches *there is a new mystical immolation in the Mass*. If he says that in this mystical

immolation is involved the ritual offering of Christ *Who is clearly exhibited on the altar by that separate consecration as the Eternal Victim of the Passion*, then this is the teaching Dr. Muldoon can oppose if he sees it to be unsound.

This mystical immolation, according to Fr. de la Taille, is not a *new real* immolation of the Victim. The one *real* immolation is the Sacred Passion and death of Christ. But the mystical immolation may not be dismissed as a *mere figure* of the Passion. For, by the mystical immolation, at the last Supper, Christ placed Himself before the Apostles clearly as the Victim actually made sacred to God, dedicated to His Passion and death. Also it involved the ritual offering of the Victim of that Passion and death. He remained the Victim (of the Passion) offered to God, all through the actual slaying of the coming night and the next day. By the mystical immolation in the Holy Mass, Jesus Christ (*ministerio sacerdotis*) places Himself clearly on the altar as the (eternal) Victim of the Sacred Passion, and through that mystical immolation the ritual offering of that Victim is performed. Thus, the Mass is the unbloody immolation of the Victim of the Sacred Passion.

(B) In the April, 1951, issue of the *A.C.R.* Dr. Muldoon treats of the nature of sacrifice. In the course of this article he refers to the opinion "advanced by a few modern theologians", naming Father de la Taille among them, "holding that a sacrifice consists in a simple oblation, no immolation being essentially required". Later in the article he notes that Father de la Taille writes: "where the principal end of sacrifice is propitiatory some destruction or slaying of the victim seems more fitting".

But let us see what Father de la Taille does hold about the nature of sacrifice and how accurately it accords with the teaching of St. Thomas.

Father de la Taille says, *M.F.*, Chap. I, par 2A: "Is destruction (formal or equivalent) of the offering as such, essentially necessary to constitute a true sacrifice? Where the primary and prevailing end is latreutic only, we hold that destruction is not necessary; that it is sufficient if, in the words of St. Thomas (2, 2, 85, 3m) something is done over the offerings as evidence of their passing from the possession of man to the possession of God, which would be a pledge of the offering that we make of ourselves". Note: Something is done over the offerings as evidence of their passing to the possession of God. So it is not a *mere oblation*. Using the words of Dr. Muldoon one might say that

Father de la Taille "did not need an Aquinas to point out that every sacrifice is an oblation, but not every oblation is a sacrifice". Indeed, he quotes the expression of William of Paris, "sacrifice is a gift *which is made sacred* in the offering"—not every oblation, but an oblation over which something is done as evidence of its being made sacred to God. And this is the teaching of St. Thomas (2-2-86-1): "nomen oblationis commune est ad omnes res quae in cultum Dei exhibentur: ita quod si aliquid exhibeatur in cultum divinum, quasi in *aliquod* sacrum quod inde fieri debeat, consumendum, et oblatio est et sacrificium". Literal translation: "the name 'oblation' is common to all things offered in divine worship, so that if something is so offered in divine worship as to be taken entirely into something sacred (which thereupon it must become) it is oblation and a sacrifice". "Si vero sic exhibeatur ut integrum maneat divino cultui deputandum, vel in usus ministrorum expendendum erit oblatio et non sacrificium". Translation: "But if it is so offered that it remains unchanged (still free), either to be deputed to divine worship or spent in the use of the ministers, it is an oblation and not a sacrifice". 'Integrum maneat' remains unchanged, i.e., nothing is done, here and now, to make it sacred to God: it is still free to be either made sacred to God, or used by the ministers. St. Thomas does not say that the oblation must be *destroyed* in every sacrifice; as long as something is done over it as evidence that, here and now, it is made sacred to God. In the preceding question (Q. 85, article 3a) St. Thomas wrote: "sacrificia proprie dicuntur quando circa res Deo oblatas aliquid fit, sicut...quod panis frangitur, comeditur, et *benedicitur*". Were not the loaves of proposition a sacrifice, and not by being destroyed? If the sacrifice, however, is a perfect propitiatory sacrifice then the offering of a victim that is slain or destroyed expresses most perfectly the sorrow, repentance and desire of reparation of those who have sinned, and for whom the sacrifice is offered in atonement to and adoration of God. Returning now to Father de la Taille: "Change of itself, or destruction of itself, *does not suffice* to integrate the sacrifice. No matter what the change or how complete the destruction, an offering to God of the thing changed or destroyed is absolutely essential, and this offering must be *sensible, ritual, liturgical*". Even in a perfect propitiatory sacrifice, a holocaust, the *sacrifice* is the ritual offering of the *victim* (of the slaying).

Applying this teaching to the Sacrifice of Redemption, Father de la Taille says: I. The Sacrifice of Redemption, was a perfect propitiatory

sacrifice—Our Lord Jesus Christ offered Himself, a perfect Victim, a holocaust, in His Passion and Death.

II. In the separate consecration of bread and wine, in that mystical immolation, performed by Our Lord at the Last Supper, is involved the ritual offering of Christ *made sacred to God as the Victim of the coming Passion and Death*, deputed to that expiatory death for us—the ritual offering of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ.

III. That ritual offering involved in the mystical immolation at the Supper determines, or informs, the whole Passion of Christ. That visible offering is “kept up by continual acts of the free will, showing themselves forth outwardly by so many acts and words of the Lord until His death”.

IV. This “sacrifice” is one “*signum visibile*” going on uninterruptedly from the Supper Room till the Passion is consummated on Calvary.

Applying this teaching to the Sacrifice of the Mass, Father de la Taille says: I. In the Mass our High Priest, through His minister, offers a perfect propitiatory sacrifice. He offers Himself, the Eternal Victim of the Sacred Passion.

II. Therefore, in the Mass there must be a true, a real Victim; it is the ritual offering of Christ as a Victim to God, through His Passion and Death.

III. The Mass is not a sacrifice *merely because* the representation of the Passion, *of itself alone*, suffices as a sign of adoration and propitiation. No. There must be a real offering of a real victim.

IV. The Mass is a Sacrifice because in the separate consecration of the bread and wine, in that mystical immolation performed by the priest (*nomine et virtute Christi in Coena*), is involved the ritual offering of Christ, *Who is clearly exhibited on the altar as the Eternal Victim of the Sacred Passion*—the glorified Lamb of God.

(C) In the January, 1952, issue of the *A.C.R.* Dr. Muldoon treats of “the relations that exist between the Supper, the Cross, and the Mass”. He makes several references to Father de la Taille, and I offer some comments on those references.

I. Page 40 (footnote), Dr. Muldoon makes the extraordinary assertion that Father de la Taille “in an attempt to escape from the obvious meaning of the decree” of Trent, resorts to tactics unworthy of scholarship. He accuses Father de la Taille of giving the words ‘*obtulit*’, and ‘*oblaturus*’ different meanings in the same sentence.

(‘obtulit’, He made the *oblation* of Himself; ‘oblaturus’, about to be *immolated*.) Really, one can only be amazed; for these are the actual comments of Father de la Taille on these words of Trent (cf. *M.F.*, chap. 3, para. 7B). “Although the Cross is a most true sacrifice, nevertheless, we must believe that Christ, as priest according to the order of Melchisedech, willed that the Supper also should be a sacrifice”. Nowhere has Father de la Taille been guilty of those tactics unworthy of scholarship of which he is accused. Indeed, “to attempt to escape from the *obvious meaning* of Trent by tactics”, a decree that Dr. Muldoon reminds us is ‘de fide’, would be not only unworthy of scholarship, but unworthy of a Catholic who treasured his faith.

II. Father de la Taille has never taught that there was a “part-sacrifice” in the Supper, and a “part-sacrifice” on the Cross. Nor has he taught that at the Last Supper, there was a “mere ritual oblation of Christ that would have to await the morrow, when it would be united to the bloody immolation of Calvary”. Surely he did so much in his writings to free his teaching from the possibility of any such interpretation. He teaches that in the Supper there was the Sacrifice of Redemption—the ritual offering of the *Victim* of the Passion of Christ, already the Victim of the Passion, already “*paratum passioni*” (as St. Thomas says) already “*aptum manducationi*”, because He is the Victim of the Passion. The separate consecration of the bread and wine placed Him there before the Apostles clearly as the Victim of the Passion, pledged to His Passion (already begun), and Death, and ritually offered to that Passion and Death. The *Sacrifice* of Redemption was essentially there in the Supper Room. The *Sacrifice* of Redemption was there in the garden of Gethsemane; the *Sacrifice* of Redemption was there in the praetorium of Pilate; the *Sacrifice* of Redemption was crowned on the Cross; there the Passion was consummated, the one *sacrifice* (present essentially right through the Passion), had run its course; the one “sign” had continued essentially present all through the Passion, all through that terrible night and day. The actual slaying of the Victim took hours; it included all the sufferings (inflicted and voluntarily accepted—accepted in the offering of the Supper Room, an offering never revoked and ever continuing), from the treason of Judas to the vinegar and gall, and the last loud cry as He expired. At any moment of those hours, the *Sacrifice* of the Cross, the *Sacrifice* of Redemption, the sacrificial offering of the *Victim* of the Passion, that ‘one sign’ is present. The sacrificial offering of the Victim

is essentially there in the Supper Room; the same numerical sacrificial offering of the Victim is there on the Cross. The actual slaying of the Victim took so many terrible hours.

III. Dr. Muldoon appeals to the Council of Trent and reminds us that here we have a 'de fide' definition. What does Trent teach? "*Etsi semel seipsum in ara crucis, morte intercedente, Deo Patri oblaturus erat...tamen...in coena novissima corpus et sanguinem suum, sub speciebus panis et vini Deo Patri obtulit*". Dr. Muldoon writes: "The main object of the Tridentine Synod was the condemnation of the pestiferous errors of the Reformers. Now, they were loudly proclaiming throughout Europe that the Mass could not be a true sacrifice because the Apostle had said Christ had offered Himself but once". Very well—the object of Trent is to condemn those reformers, How? By defining the *exact logical contradictory* of their heresy. What is the exact logical contradictory of their heresy? Well, it is a simple exercise in logic. Proposition: He did not sacrifice in the Supper because He sacrificed but once, i.e., on the Cross. Contradictory: Although he sacrificed once, i.e., on the Cross, nevertheless He sacrificed in the Supper. That is what is defined. The fathers of Trent did not define whether there were two sacrifices, or whether the sacrifice of the Supper is numerically one with that of the Cross. They simply defined: there was a sacrifice in the Supper even though He sacrificed once, morte intercedente, on the Cross. If Father de la Taille teaches that, he is in perfect agreement with what Trent has defined. Now, he does say that. It is merely a matter of free discussion among theologians whether he is correct in holding that the one numerical sacrifice ('qua' sacrifice or 'sign') could be present throughout the whole Passion, till the Passion was consummated on Calvary.

(D) It is not my purpose to enter on a full defence of Father de la Taille's teaching. However, since Dr. Muldoon quotes the words of Pope Pius XII in his encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, I think it well to compare the central teaching of *Mysterium Fidei* with those words. Dr. Muldoon quotes: I. "Christ the High Priest, through an unbloody immolation does what he already did on the Cross: He offers Himself a most pleasing Victim to the Eternal Father". Now, if Father de la Taille says "there is no new immolation in the Mass" these words of Pope Pius XII would definitely oppose his teaching. But Father de la Taille does not say that. He says that Christ the High Priest, in the separate consecration of bread and wine, offers Himself a most pleasing

Victim, through an unbloody immolation to His Heavenly Father.

II. "It must be emphasised again and again, that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is essentially the unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim, an immolation mystically manifested in the separation of the sacred species, and the offering made of them to the Eternal Father". Again if Father de la Taille says "there is no new immolation in the Mass" these words of Pope Pius XII would definitely oppose his teaching. But he does not say that. He says that in the separate consecration of the bread and wine, in the mystical immolation performed by the priest (nomine et virtute Christi in coena), is involved the ritual offering of Christ, the Eternal Victim of Calvary, Who is clearly exhibited on the altar, in the separation of the sacred species, as the Victim of the Sacred Passion. This unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim is the Mass.

III. "On the Cross the immolation of the Victim was wrought by a bloody death voluntarily accepted. But on the altar, by reason of the glorious condition of the Sacred Humanity, death will no longer have dominion over Him (Romans 6, 9), and therefore the shedding of His Blood is not possible. Nevertheless, in accordance with the plan of Divine Wisdom, *the sacrificing of Our Redeemer (on the altar), is marvellously manifested by external signs symbolic of death.* For by the transubstantiation of bread into the Body of Christ, and of the wine into His Blood, both His Body and Blood are really rendered present: but the Eucharistic species under which He is present, symbolize the violent separation of His Body and Blood. Thus a commemorative showing forth of His death, which actually took place on Calvary, is repeated in all the sacrifices of the altar, because by the separate signs (species) Christ Jesus is signified and shown forth in the state of a victim". How accurately the genuine teaching of Father de la Taille corresponds with these words of the Holy Father. For this is what Father de la Taille teaches: In the separate consecration of bread and wine, in that mystical immolation, Christ is exhibited clearly as the Victim of the Sacred Passion, His death is clearly shown forth; and in that mystical immolation is involved the ritual offering of that Eternal Victim so clearly manifested by those external signs symbolic of death.

There is a further statement of the Holy Father in his encyclical (in addition to those quoted by Dr. Muldoon) with which we might compare the teaching of *Mysterium Fidei*. The Pope writes: "At idcirco quod sacerdos divinam victimam altari superponit eandem Deo Patri qua oblationem defert" (For that very reason that the priest

places the Divine Victim upon the altar therefore he presents that same Victim as an oblation to God the Father.) Father de la Taille says that in the sacred rite of consecration (in that mystical immolation), in the very act by which the priest places Jesus Christ on the altar clearly as the Victim of Calvary, he presents that same Victim as an oblation to God the Father. Now, the Pope says that the faithful (*suo modo*) participate in this *offering*. But he adds: "*Populum vero una cum ipso sacerdote offerre non idcirco statuitur quod Ecclesiae membra, haud aliter ac ipse sacerdos; ritum liturgicum adspectabilem perficiant*". In other words, the priest does perform "*ritum liturgicum adspectabilem*" through which the Victim is *offered*, and the priest alone performs this *ritual offering* (as Christ's minister). Father de la Taille says the priest through the mystical immolation performs a ritual offering "the liturgical rite which pragmatically expresses the handing over of the Victim to God". With Pope Pius XII Father de la Taille teaches that there are, however, two ways in which the faithful do share (*suo modo*) in offering the Victim: 1st, because Christ *as Head of the Church*, offers Himself (*ministerio sacerdotis*); and 2nd, because their adoration, love and thanksgiving is united with the adoration, love and thanksgiving of their Head and High Priest in the very offering, which, in the name of all, He makes of Himself. This "*cultus internus*" is *manifested* by the external rite of sacrifice—the ritual offering of the Divine Victim of Calvary through an unbloody immolation.

For the sake of a better understanding of Father de la Taille's teaching on the Holy Mass, these comments have been written. That teaching, while it has been accepted by some, does not meet with the approval of other learned theologians; but it commends itself to many priests who have found it so helpful. Unless it is shown to be unsound, they will feel obliged to cherish it in gratitude for the help it has given.

I am, etc.,

JAMES GREEN, C.S.S.R.

# Dogmatic Theology

## THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS, VIII. ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES.

In our attempts at answering Fr. Green's difficulties and objections, which appear in this same number of the *Record*, our marks of reference (A, B, C, etc.) correspond to the same marks used by him.

*CONCERNING A:* Here Fr. Green raises two objections. Firstly, Fr. Green denies the truth of our statement that, in Fr. de la Taille's theory, "there is no new immolation of Christ the Victim" in the Mass. Now, the whole context from which the statement was taken, makes it clear that we were speaking of *sacrificial* immolation, i.e., an immolation of the Victim that is *sufficient for a true sacrifice*. We also said that explicitly when touching on his theory later: "There is no new *sacrificial immolation* of Christ on the altar".<sup>1</sup> We had pointed out that since the Mass is a true, propitiatory sacrifice, there must be found in it a true, sacrificial immolation of the victim. Fr. de la Taille agrees perfectly with that. The question then is: does the sacrificial immolation of Christ take place *on the altar*? We maintain that it does; Fr. de la Taille maintains that it does not. Neither Fr. de la Taille nor ourselves maintain that a merely *symbolic* immolation is sufficient for a true sacrifice. For him, the only truly sacrificial immolation involved in the Mass is the bloody immolation which took place on Calvary, and is now again offered (oblated) by the church in a certain commemorative effigy of Christ's death on the Cross. Hence, the summary of his doctrine given by his confrère, Fr. L. Lercher, S.J.: "In the Mass, the victim immolated on the Cross is in nowise placed by us in a state of victimhood by a new immolation, but remaining a victim from the Cross He is offered by the Church; and the oblation is involved in a sort of effigy of death, or a sort of representative or commemorative immolation".<sup>2</sup>

We do not deny that Fr. de la Taille speaks of a "symbolic representation" of Christ's one only true sacrificial immolation, or that, in this sense, he speaks of a "mystical immolation" of Christ. We simply deny that he teaches any true sacrificial immolation of Christ on the altar; any placing of Christ in a state of true victimhood sufficient for a true sacrifice, here and now on the altar.

---

<sup>1</sup>A.C.R., Jan., 1952, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup>Institutiones Theol. Dogm., vol. 4/2, p. 301, ed. 1948.

Fr. de la Taille could never think of teaching any such thing. Were he to do so he would, with his own hand, blast the very foundations of his whole theory of the Mass. He would have to admit that on the altar we have everything required for a true, propitiatory sacrifice, without having recourse to the bloody immolation of Calvary as to an essential constituent of the sacrifice. He rests his whole case on the assertion that the Mass is the oblation of Christ, the Victim, "not now to be immolated, but already immolated in His Passion". (*Mysterium Fidei*, p. 33, n. 1.)<sup>3</sup>

"A true sacrifice," he says, "is the true, sensible oblation of a victim truly immolated". (p. 303). To get the victim of the Mass "truly immolated" he has to leave the altar and go to Calvary. There, is found, for him, the only true immolation sufficient for sacrifice. "The Mass," he says, "is nothing more than our new oblation of the ancient immolation performed in the Passion". (p. 103, n. 4.) Consequently, when he speaks of a "mystical immolation" of Christ in the Mass, he means it, not in the sense of any *true sacrificial immolation*, but rather in sensu abusivo: *a commemorative effigy of the one sacrificial immolation*.

Considering the Mass purely as a sacrifice of the present (i.e., not concentrating on it as a rite representative of Christ's death) the only value of de la Taille's "symbolic immolation" is found in the assertion that the *oblation* of Christ's bloody immolation is somehow involved or wrapped up in it. "Our oblation, which we shall show to be an *actual and true oblation* of the Victim of the Passion, consists (consistit), indeed, in that *symbolic immolation*; it belongs to it that it be the the oblation of the *true immolation, which is the bloody immolation*". (p. 237, n. 2.) Definitely, it is more an oblation than any form of immolation! According to him, we do not need the Consecration to place Christ in a state of sacrificial victimhood. He is permanently in that state. We need the Consecration to give us the Victim, and place Him under a symbol, image, effigy, representation of His only true sacrificial immolation. "We make the *oblation* of a victim *long ago immolated, and permanently remaining in his state of victimhood*. . . . Our oblation, like Christ's (at the Supper) is involved in a sort of portrait-like immolation (*similitudinaria quadam immolatione*); this symbolic immolation was, in the Supper, referred to the Passion as to a future event, but in the Mass it signifies the Passion as already completed. In the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ed. 1924.

Mass, as in the Supper, the oblation is real and actual (*praesens*), *not merely represented, as the immolation is*. By the Eucharistic Celebration we make a true oblation to God of Christ's bloody death, in a sort of unbloody effigy, or sacramental commemoration". (p. 195.) Again: "A certain *merely representative immolation* of Christ was had at the Last Supper". (p. 35.) And in the Mass there is "*only a symbolic imitation* of Christ's death of long ago". (p. 312.) He places this objection to his own theory: "How can the Mass be a *true sacrifice* when it lacks a *true immolation*, and has only a *similitudinary, representative, sacramental, or, as the Greek has it, mystical, symbolic immolation, which is indeed an imitation of the real immolation*, but is not it in reality?" (p. 237.) He answers, of course, that this symbolism is not sufficient for true sacrifice, but still the Mass is a true sacrifice because therein is made the oblation of the one true immolation, that of Calvary. Christ is not sacrificially immolated in the Mass.

That is all we said that he said. We hope it will lessen Fr. Green's indignation.

Secondly, Fr. Green denies that Fr. de la Taille teaches "that the Mass consists essentially in the mere oblation made by the Church of the bloody immolation of Christ which took place 2000 years ago". And that "this oblation of the once immolated victim formally constitutes the Mass a true sacrifice".

We insist that that is Fr. de la Taille's teaching. "The Mass," he says, "is nothing more than our new oblation of the ancient immolation performed in the Passion". (p. 103, n. 4.) Again: "The Mass is a sacrifice precisely because of this, that in it there is made by us the oblation of Christ made a victim from His Passion. In the Supper Christ made the oblation of His Body to be *immolated* in the Passion. We do the same thing, but inversely: in the Supper was made the oblation of Christ *not yet immolated*, but to be immolated; in the Mass, we make the oblation of Christ, *not now to be immolated, but already immolated*". (p. 33.) Consequently: "immediately after the Consecration the sacrifice of the Mass is completed: because the *immolation preceded the Consecration*. Therefore, the Supper and the Mass differ in this, that in the Supper is had the oblation of the victim to be immolated, whereas in the Mass is had the oblation of the victim *already immolated*". (p. 104.) Christ "remains from His Passion in a true state of victimhood". (p. 303.) We do not place Him in a true state of sacrificial victimhood in the

Mass. "We make the oblation of the bloody death of Christ. It is one and the same thing to make an oblation of the body of Christ *suffering and dead*, and to offer His death and Passion. . . . And it is one and the same thing to make an oblation of Christ existing as a victim from His former immolation, and to make an oblation of that very immolation". (p. 195.)

Now, how do these two elements, in which the Mass, as a sacrifice, consists, coalesce in one sacrifice? Let us hear Fr. de la Taille: "We have", he says, "a oneness of sacrifice, *consisting of the oblation made in the Eucharist and the bloody immolation of Christ*. . . . And these two parts are not to be considered as merely integrating parts; they must absolutely be considered as *constitutive* parts, like the parts of the essence of bodily substances. Of these two parts, *the oblation is as the determining form; the immolation is as the matter, receiving into itself the formal constituent*". (p. 102.)

That is precisely what we said that he said. And we said we could not reconcile it with the defined doctrine of Trent, and much else. A few brief considerations on these points:

One cannot take seriously the assertion that Christ remains, from His passion, in a state of formal sacrificial victimhood. That is too much. The gloriously risen Christ, living immortally and incorruptibly, no semblance of death having any dominion over His physical Person (Romans, 6, 9) *is not, de facto, in a state of sacrificial victimhood*. That victimal state of Christ, consisting *FORMALLY* in the physical separation of Christ's Body and Blood in His death on Calvary (which is the only true sacrificial state of victimhood that Fr. de la Taille admits), far from being rendered permanent in Christ, was *FORMALLY AND FOREVER* taken away by His glorious resurrection, as St. Paul teaches, and as is quite obvious in itself. The glorious Christ is the victim of our sacrifice, but He is not in a formal condition of victimhood. These are two quite different things. In order to offer Him in sacrifice, you must place Him in a state of sacrificial immolation. But Fr. de la Taille makes the contrary a primary foundation of his theory. And he must logically admit that Christ in the Tabernacle is in a formal state of sacrificial immolation!

Then, how can one possibly accept the statement that Christ is *not placed in a true state of sacrificial victimhood in the Mass, but is only symbolically immolated*? Trent did not teach that Christ is merely symbolically immolated on the altar. Trent taught that Christ is *truly* immolated, *under* the symbols, i.e., the species of bread and wine. That

is quite a different thing from mere symbolical, representative, imitative immolation. "He instituted the new Pasch: *Himself, to be immolated* by His priests, *under visible signs*". (Denzinger, 839.) It is as truly a sacrificial immolation as that of the Paschal Lamb "which the children of Israel immolated". (Ibid.)

If there were any doubt about this, it is definitely removed by the authoritative interpretation of Pope Pius XII. He tells us that Christ, the victim, *is unbloodyly immolated*, and that that immolation *is manifested mystically* by the separate species, or symbols, of bread and wine. He pointedly distinguishes between the true, real, though unbloody immolation of the victim, and symbolic manifestation of that true immolation. Is it a truly *sacrificial* immolation? Of course it is: the Pontiff teaches that the Mass, which is a true sacrifice, "*is essentially that unbloody immolation*". If, then, that unbloody immolation is not a true, sacrificial immolation, by which Christ is placed in a formal state of victimhood, the Mass is not a true sacrifice! That is obvious; and it is of supreme importance. We put it thus: Since it is a Dogma of Faith that the Mass is a *true sacrifice*; and since the Pontiff teaches that the sacrifice "is, of its very nature, that unbloody immolation" of Christ on the Altar; to maintain that the Pontiff does not teach that the immolation is a *truly sacrificial immolation*, is to maintain that the Pontiff denies a Dogma of the Faith!<sup>4</sup>

It is quite useless for Fr. Green to say that "if Fr. de la Taille says there is *no new immolation* of Christ in the Mass, these words of Pope Pius XII would definitely oppose his teaching". One must hold that the immolation in the Mass is a *truly sacrificial immolation*, which places Christ the victim in a state of formal victimhood, and that the Mass is essentially that, (neither of which is held by Fr. de la Taille) or one must part company with the Pontiff. To say that the immolation in the Mass is merely symbolic, representative, not truly sacrificial in the full sense, is definitely to oppose the Pontiff's teaching.<sup>5</sup> We have the ex-

---

<sup>4</sup>We do not say that Fr. Green is culpable of such rashness. We are merely indicating the illogicality and untenableness of his position.

<sup>5</sup>We can readily imagine someone saying: "perhaps we could still defend our position by saying that the unbloody immolation is truly sacrificial, and that the Mass is essentially that immolation, in this sense: the *immolation* is not precisely that, but the *oblation* which is involved in a merely symbolic immolation, is all that." But no one will fail to see that such an interpretation is an open abuse of the Pontiff's words. Besides, the Pontiff himself closed the door to such an interpretation. He tells us in the same Encyclical that when he says "immolation" he means "immolation" in the strict sense, as opposed to "oblation", because he wishes "to avoid any mistake in this very important matter". *Mediator Dei*, Acta A.S., 1947, p. 555.)

PLICIT words of the Pontiff which leave no room for doubt: "The unbloody immolation by which, after the words of Consecration have been pronounced, *Christ is rendered present on the altar in the state of a victim*, is performed by the Priest alone . . ."<sup>6</sup> The words of Consecration not only give us the Victim of the sacrifice; they are a word-sword that sacrificially immolates Him, and places Him in a state of formal victimhood. The Pope warns us that we are not at liberty to treat his doctrine, on the essential constitution of the Mass, lightly. He says that it "must be emphasized again and again that the Mass is, of its very nature, that unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim". Thus, Fr. de la Taille's theory seems destroyed at its foundations.

Finally, on this point, the *MYSTERY* of the Mass (it is a mystery!) for the Fathers of the Church, as for us, lies in the fact that Christ, "although rising from the dead dieth no more, yet, while living immortally and incorruptibly in His own Person, *is immolated again* in the mystery of this sacred sacrifice". (Pope St. Gregory, *Dialogus* 4, 58.) The mystery of the Mass is in the true, sacrificial immolation of the Victim, here and now on the altar. But there is no mystery in mere symbolic, imitative immolation, even if the oblation of the victim be involved in that symbolism. Where is the mystery in my simply making an oblation of a victim already sacrificially immolated before it is brought to me, even if it is brought under the symbolic representation of death? But there is a profound mystery in the true sacrificial immolation, or placing of Christ the Victim in a formal state of victimhood, by the word-sword of the priest, which, "by an unbloody cutting, divides the Body and Blood of the Lord", as another Gregory said. That is where the Church places the mystery: not in the real presence of Christ under the species, (which is another matter) nor in the oblation of the victim, but in the real presence of Christ *here and now immolated truly in a true sacrifice*. We are not free to place it elsewhere.

Another point: How can one accept the assertion that, as far as immolation is concerned, there is in the Mass only "a representative, symbolic imitation" of Christ's death? Apart from what we have just seen of the Church's teaching to the contrary, Pope Leo XIII teaches clearly that the Mass is "a true and wonderful, though unbloody and mystical *RENEWAL* of Christ's death". Christ's bloody immolation, therefore, *is truly made anew*, in an unbloody and wonderful way, on the altar. Thus also Pius XI speaks of "the one bloody sacrifice of Christ, which

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, p. 555.

is continually renewed in an unbloody manner on our altars". But a mere symbolic, imitative immolation is not a *true renewal, or making anew*. Someone might say that in the Mass we have a true renewal of Christ's death precisely because we make "a new oblation of the ancient immolation". But is not that an open contradiction of the Pontiff's words when he tells us that it is the *death of Christ, the bloody immolation of Christ*, that is truly renewed, not the oblation of it? Besides, the words "unbloody" and "mystical", which qualify the noun "renewal", are manifestly opposed to the "bloody sacrifice" and "Christ's death", and thus clearly point to the renewal of the *immolation* of Calvary. But for Fr. de la Taille this is not had in the Mass. He says the oblation is renewed, or, made anew; but not the immolation, which is only symbolically represented. (p. 195.) Whom shall we heed?

Then, the very foundation of Fr. de la Taille's theory is the *part-sacrifice* of the Cenacle, coalescing with the *part-sacrifice* of Calvary to make one only numerical sacrifice. But the Council of Trent reaches that Christ offered two sacrifices, numerically and adequately distinct; one in the Cenacle (the Mass), the other on Calvary (Cf. A.C.R., Jan., 1952, pp. 37 ff.). That being so, the theory is false in its foundation; and since everything else rests on that, no amount of logic can avail to make the rest of the theory true. Suppose Fr. Green were to make this public statement: "Although I am going to build a brick monastery here in X this year, nevertheless I am going to build a wooden monastery in Y next year". Surely everyone would understand that he was going to build two adequately distinct monasteries, two numerically different monasteries! Well, suppose someone were to report him thus: "Fr. Green says that he is going to build *one only monastery*; he says that this year he is going to construct the foundations of brick, and that next year he will complete the building, in wood; the two parts will coalesce in one fine building". Absurd? Well, that is how Fr. Green wants us to understand the words of the Council of Trent: Our Lord, although He was going to offer Himself in a bloody sacrifice on the Cross, nevertheless He offered Himself in an unbloody sacrifice in the Cenacle on the previous night.

If Christ did not offer two sacrifices, the Council has led us astray, and we are become as sheep without a shepherd. For, the vast majority of theologians understand the words of the Council in that way; and such would be the obvious interpretation of any Catholic reading the Council's definitive Decree: two sacrifices; two oblations, two immolations.

In his recent Encyclical, "Menti Nostrae", the Sovereign Pontiff again gives the traditional teaching. He teaches that Christ performed a true sacrifice on Calvary; and that there, while hanging on the Cross, he made the oblation of His bloody immolation.<sup>7</sup> He teaches that everything that has always been required for a true sacrifice was found in the sacrifice on Calvary: "a true sacrifice is the true, sensible oblation of a victim truly immolated" (MF., p. 303.) Yet Fr. de la Taille maintains that Christ did not perform a true sacrifice on Calvary, but only a part-sacrifice; he maintains that Christ did not there make the sacrificial oblation of His bloody immolation (p. 31.) Whom shall we heed?

The foregoing are some of the fundamental points of Fr. de la Taille's theory. Apart from any theological arguments we moved against it, we do not see how it can stand when confronted with the Church's magisterium. As one of his confrères has said, when it is brought to face that decisive criterion "its foundations crash and crumble".

Fr. Green says that until this theory is "shown to be unsound", he and others "will feel obliged to cherish it in gratitude for the help it has given". That is a noble sentiment; and we do not presume to play the part of a modern Daniel, with him in the rôle of Baltasar.

*CONCERNING B:* Fr. Green here reminds us of a fundamental aspect of Fr. de la Taille's theory that is not devoid of humour. It reminds us always of those accomplished gentlemen who produce rabbits from empty hats. Fr. de la Taille quotes several theologians expressing the traditional teaching, universally accepted, that the oblation of the victim of sacrifice must be *external, sense-perceptible*: "*oblatio externa, sensibilis*". (MF. p. 29.) But,—and here is the hat-trick—he immediately slips in the adjectives "ritual, liturgical" as *synonymous with "sensible, external"*, whereas they introduce a totally new element, a new and different idea! So now the oblation must be "*sensibilis, ritualis, liturgica*". (p. 11, 29.) Now the classic definition of Augustine: "The *visible* sacrifice is the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice", must be translated: "The *ritual, liturgical* sacrifice is the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice"! It was all neatly done, and some fell for it. Then, with the wool thus pulled over their eyes, the author took them

---

<sup>7</sup>"Sacrificium, quod Divinus Redemptor e cruce pendens in Calvariae monte obtulit, sui proprii corporis *immolatio* fuit; ipse enim semet ipsum piacularem hostiam dedit". (Acta A.S., 1950, p. 666.)

by the hand and said: Now, from Gethsemane to the "consummatum est" on the Cross, where do you find the *sensible, ritual, liturgical oblation* of the bloody sacrifice of Christ? Nowhere! But I will tell you where Christ the Priest made that sensible, *liturgical, ritual* oblation of the bloody sacrifice: in the Cenacle! And so, you see, Christ did not offer two sacrifices, one in the Cenacle and the other on Calvary, but one only sacrifice, numerically one, composed of two parts: the ritual oblation in the Cenacle, and the bloody immolation of Calvary. "*Unum numero fuit sacrificium redemptionis in cruce et in coena; nec computandum unum sacrificium praeliminarium in coena, alterum in cruce succidaneum; sed in coenaculo fiebat incruenta oblatio cruentae immolationis in calvaria perpetiendae*". (MF. p. 101.) Thus the whole theory was born!

Those who were fascinated by this logic did not question the major premise. They did not consider: 1) that he had slipped into the definition of sacrifice, and as an essential element of it, something that neither Christian tradition nor the common persuasion of mankind ever contemplated as necessary; 2) that he made the theologians say something that they had never thought of saying, when he translated their words "*sensibilis, externa*", as "*sensibilis, ritualis, liturgica*", thereby quite arbitrarily changing the universal definition; 3) that his new definition of oblation could never stand: for, according to what *liturgy or ritual* was the oblation of Noe's sacrifice made, or Abel's, or Abraham's, to mention only a few? Yet, Sacred Scripture tells us they were true sacrifices, accepted by God and most pleasing to Him! In each case there was verified the only oblation that has ever been required: *oblatio sensibilis*; 4) that, according to Fr. de la Taille himself, the *oblatio sensibilis* of Christ's bloody sacrifice was, *de facto*, found in the *Passion of Christ itself*, as has always been taught by our tradition. He admits that the internal dispositions, the internal oblation of Christ, were externally manifested "by so many and so great actions and words of the Lord even till the moment of His death"; (p. 102) 5) that it is the undeniable teaching of the Church from the earliest time, and the common teaching of theologians, that Christ made the *priestly oblation* of the sacrifice of Calvary in *His actual Passion*, and particularly on the Cross: "*oblatus est in cruce, et immolatus est in cruce*"; "*in cruce, idem sacerdos, idem et hostia*". (cf. A.C.R., Jan., 1952, p. 33 ff.); 6) that the Church and the Fathers have always taught that the Sacrifice of Calvary was, by itself and of itself, a true, perfect, complete sacrifice;

7) that Christ, because He was not made a priest by any rite, or liturgy, or ceremony of ordination, but by the hypostatic union itself, had no need whatsoever to go through any ritual, or liturgical form, in order to offer the sacrifice of Redemption.<sup>8</sup>

It was a strange and unhappy innovation on which to build a theory. Once it is shown that it is not at all necessary for the oblation to be "ritual, liturgical", but that a sense-perceptible, external oblation is all that is required, (as has always been taught) the fundamental postulate of the theory falls. In Fr. de la Taille's own ingenuous words: "It is hardly credible that the formal element of our Lord's sacrifice should have become known only in our own day". (p. 30.)

Concerning the other points raised by Fr. Green under B, a brief comment will suffice: a) Fr. de la Taille does not require any immolation for sacrifice in general (MF., p. 3 ff.). The condition that "something be done over the oblata as evidence of their passing from the possession of man to the possession of God", would be fulfilled by merely making the sign of the Cross over them. But who would consider that a sacrifice?

b) Fr. Green's translation of St. Thomas' word, "consummendum", by the phrase "taken over entirely", is quite arbitrary, and disproved by the context which demands the obvious translation, "consumed", destroyed. St. Thomas says: "If anything is used for divine worship, as for something sacred, which is therein to be consumed, it is both an oblation and a sacrifice; wherefore it is said in Exodus, c. 29: Thou shalt offer the whole ram for a burnt offering upon the altar; it is an oblation to the Lord: a most sweet savour of the victim of the Lord". Fr. Green's interpretation of St. Thomas' word "integrum" is also quite arbitrary and is opposed to the context. St. Thomas continues: "If however it is used so that it remains entire in the act of worship of God, or if it is used for the convenience of the ministers, it will be an oblation, not a sacrifice". The word "integrum" is here opposed to "consummendum", which means consumed, destroyed. Similarly, Fr. Green omitted St. Thomas' explanation of what he means by those words: "circa res oblatas aliquid fit". St. Thomas again gives his examples of animals slain or burned in sacrifice: "quando aliquid aliud fit inde, puta quod comburebatur, tunc vocabatur sacrificium". St. Thomas teaches that the "aliquid fit" must intrinsically change, consume, or destroy the thing oblatus.<sup>9</sup> The obscurity to which we referred in our article, and which everyone, except Fr. Green, admits to be an obscurity, is found in 2-2, 85, 3, ad 3. Here St. Thomas, among other examples that are quite clear, gives that of "bread broken, eaten, blessed". The obscurity ceases if we accept those words as referring to the Eucharist. But we cannot enlarge on that here.

c) The loaves of propitiation were a sacrifice; and they were destroyed sacrificially. (cf. Levit., 24, 7; 24, 9; Franzelin, Thes. 21.)

---

<sup>8</sup>Fr. de la Taille maintains, in short, that no external, sensible oblation of Christ was a priestly oblation. To be that it must be ritual, liturgical: "We must especially ask where and when that voluntary and active dedication of Himself, as a victim, unto the cult of God was made by Christ sensibly, ritually, liturgically. Which is the same as asking by what external act Christ, in regard to His passion, acted as a priest". (p. 29.) But the two things are not the same. On the Cross Christ was priest, and there he made the priestly oblation of Himself by so many and so great actions and words, externally manifesting His internal dedication. That is our tradition.

<sup>9</sup>2-2, 85, 3, ad 3; 2-2, 86, 1; In Psalm 34, 4; 3, 48, 3.

d) Fr. Green's quotation from Fr. de la Taille: "Change, of itself...etc., is not ad rem. The author is there speaking of a *propitiatory* sacrifice, for which he does require destruction, or immolation, of the victim. (p. 10-11.) Fr. Green's reflection on us is unfounded.

**CONCERNING C:** Fr. Green is here amazed, and denies the truth of our statement that Fr. de la Taille teaches a part-sacrifice in the Supper, and a part-sacrifice on Calvary, the two coalescing in one numerical sacrifice. But every tyro of sacramental theology knows that Fr. de la Taille teaches that Christ performed one only sacrifice, consisting of two essential elements: the ritual, liturgical oblation made at the Supper, and the sacrificial immolation of Calvary; that these two elements coalesced, as matter and form, in one only complete sacrifice; that the one sacrifice was begun in the Cenacle and was essentially completed on the Cross; that, consequently, this theory is characteristically known as "unicism", as opposed to the traditional teaching of two distinct sacrifices performed by our Lord. Let us hear the author himself:

"The sacrifice of Redemption was numerically one, on the Cross and in the Supper. We must not count one preliminary sacrifice in the Supper, and a second ensuing sacrifice on the Cross". (p. 101.) So, there was not a true, complete sacrifice in the Supper, and another true, complete sacrifice on Calvary. What, then, happened in the Supper? "In the Cenacle there was made the unbloody *oblation* of the bloody immolation that was to be endured on Calvary". (Ibid.) "In the Supper Christ made the *ritual oblation* of the sacrifice of His Passion". And thus "in the Supper there was *begun* that sacrifice which was to be *completed* on the Cross". (Ibid.) Consequently, "the Supper and the Cross are complementary (*inter se complement*)". (Ibid.) The two of them together, i.e., the ritual oblation of the Supper and the bloody immolation of Calvary, made up *one complete sacrifice*, the sacrifice of Redemption.

What does all this mean, except that a part of the sacrifice was performed in the Supper, and the other part was performed on the Cross, and the two made up one only complete sacrifice? Either there was a true, complete sacrifice in the Supper, or there was not. If there was, one cannot speak of that sacrifice forming one numerical sacrifice with the sacrifice of the Cross, just as one cannot speak of two men forming one numerical man. If there was not a true, complete sacrifice, but one essential element which was later united to the other essential element, then you have two sacrificial parts united in one sacrificial whole; just

as the body is united to the soul to make up one man, numerically one. And that is what Fr. de la Taille teaches concerning the ritual oblation made at the Supper and the bloody immolation made on Calvary: "The formal part of the sacrifice was conspicuous in the Supper; the Passion of Christ was the material part of the sacrifice". (p. 10.) Again, those two parts, the oblation of the Supper and the immolation of Calvary, "must not be considered as merely integrating parts, but definitely as constitutive parts; and of the two, the oblation is as the determining form, while the immolation is as the matter receiving the formal constituent". (p. 102.) Hence, in the one sacrifice performed by Christ, "the Passion, right up to His death, was determined *ad esse sacrificale* by the eucharistic oblation of Christ".

We repeat that for Fr. de la Taille there was a part-sacrifice in the Supper, and a part-sacrifice on the Cross, and the two essential parts coalesced, as matter and form, in one numerical, complete sacrifice. And we repeat that the ritual oblation of the Supper had to wait the morrow to receive its complement, i.e., the bloody immolation; then only there was verified the one, true, complete sacrifice, or, "the unity of the constitutive parts". (p. 102.) The author rejects duality of sacrifice, but teaches duality of constitutive parts coalescing in one sacrificial whole. If you leave aside the Supper, he says, there was no true sacrifice at any time from Gethsemani to the "*consummatum est*", precisely because there was no sacrificial oblation, (which is the formal constituent of sacrifice) though there was a true immolation. (p. 28 ff.) Similarly, in the Cenacle, considered apart from the Passion, there was no true, complete sacrifice because there was no *sacrificial* immolation; that came later, on Calvary.

To say that "in the Supper there was the *Sacrifice of Redemption*", is rhetoric, not theology. It is a Dogma of Faith that the Sacrifice of Redemption was performed on the Cross. The Church has defined that in the Supper there was, not the Sacrifice of Redemption, but another sacrifice which would always represent, perpetuate the memory and apply the fruits of the Sacrifice of Redemption. That is the Mass.

Fr. Green would have to qualify the statement, as Fr. de la Taille did, saying that he meant that Christ, in the Cenacle, made the *ritual oblation* of the victim prepared for the Passion. But the ritual oblation was not a sacrifice, much less the Sacrifice of Redemption; it was only one essential element of the Sacrifice. Similarly, "the Sacrifice of Redemption was there *essentially* in the Supper Room"; yes, in the

sense of this theory, that the *ritual oblation* was made there, nothing more. And so on, with the rest of Fr. Green's poignant remarks.

Likewise, one cannot accept as literally true, in this theory, those other words quoted by Fr. Green: "Although the Cross is a most true sacrifice, nevertheless we must believe that Christ willed that the Supper should *ALSO* be a sacrifice". How strange! One would infer that there were two true sacrifices. But no; we are immediately told that "the Cross *together with the Supper* was one sacrifice only"; that "the one sacrifice was *BEGUN* in the Supper and *COMPLETED* on the Cross"; that the formal element of the one sacrifice was found in the Supper, and the material element was verified on the Cross, and thus the Supper was bound to the Cross in one numerical sacrifice. Now, how can the *BEGINNING* of a sacrifice be a true sacrifice, even if that beginning verifies one of the two essential elements of sacrifice? Given that the Cross was "a most true sacrifice", (which, in this theory, it was not, apart from the Supper) how can one say that the Supper was *also* a sacrifice, when it still lacked its essential complement,—the bloody immolation? If the Cross "*together with the Supper* formed one only sacrifice", how may one say that the Supper was *also* a sacrifice? And if it be said they are exactly one and the same numerical sacrifice, there is as much truth and logic in that as there would be in saying that the soul (the formal element in man) is the same individual thing as the body (the material element). *Qui potest capere, capiat*.

Finally, Fr. Green is amazed because we said that Fr. de la Taille plays fast and loose with the Decree of Trent when he gives two very different meanings to exactly the same word, "offerre", in the two clauses of the Decree, whereas everything in the Decree demands the same meaning in both clauses, namely, "to perform a true sacrifice". He might be more amazed to learn that Fr. de la Taille himself admits that he takes the word in two different senses, and he confesses that if the Council used the word in the broad sense in both clauses, then his explanation of Trent is false. (p. 103, n. 1.) He says that "although there was a sacrifice on the Cross, nevertheless we maintain that at the Supper Christ did *offer* His Body and Blood", in the sense that he made the *ritual oblation* of His bloody sacrifice of the morrow, not in the sense that He performed a true, complete sacrifice in the Cenacle.

Let the unicists be consistent in this matter of terminology. If they accept the Tridentine word, "offerre", in both clauses of the Decree in the sense of "to perform a true sacrifice", then they must conclude that

Christ enacted two sacrifices, numerically and specifically distinct; which they do not admit. If they accept the word, in both clauses, in the restricted sense, "to make an oblation", then they must admit that Christ made two oblations; which they do not admit. If they accept that word, in both clauses, again in a restricted sense, but this time as meaning "immolation" as opposed to "oblation" and to sacrifice", then they must admit two sacrificial immolations of Christ; which they do not admit. So they are forced to give different meanings to the same word used by Trent in the same sense in both clauses. They use the word, in the second clause, in the restricted sense of "oblation", and in the first clause in the broad sense of "sacrificing", or in the other restricted sense of "immolation". Indeed, since, in their theory, our Lord sacrificed once only, and since the formal element of that one sacrifice (i.e., the oblation) was found in the Supper, whereas the material element (the immolation) was found on Calvary, they must, if they wish to be consistent, take the Tridentine word, "offerre", now as meaning "oblation" in the restricted sense, and now as meaning "immolation" in the restricted sense. But they cannot have it both ways. As someone has said, they cannot play at "heads I win and tails you lose". No one will play with them on those grounds.

Fr. Green is at heart a dualist, but he does not know it. He admits that Trent defined that "Christ *sacrificed* in the Supper". That is right. No one, whether Catholic or Protestant, ever denied that Christ performed a true sacrifice on Calvary, in the broad sense of a true, perfect, complete sacrifice. The question was: did Christ, apart from and in spite of that sacrifice, perform yet another true, complete, perfect sacrifice (the Mass) in the Cenacle? Trent defined that He did. Trent defined that He performed two sacrifices with quite different characteristics. Trent did not define that He made only a ritual oblation in the Supper. Fr. Green is right: Christ *sacrificed* in the Supper. But one can never be sure as to what he precisely means by that verb "sacrifice", can one?<sup>10</sup>

THOMAS MULDOON.

---

<sup>10</sup>We agree with Fr. de la Taille that our doctrine concerning sacrifice must be based primarily on what Scripture teaches us (p. 7, n. 2). And we stress against him that it is a fact, a thousand times expressed in the Old Testament, that the immolation of the victim, by God's express command, is an essential element of sacrifice. In every case sacrifice involved immolation.

# Moral Theology

## GRAVE SIN OF THEFT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

With the rapidly changing value of money, the estimates given in the Text Books as to what constitutes grave matter for a sin of theft are scarcely applicable at the present time. Could you suggest some practical guide as to how one might arrive at a safe opinion on this point?

PETRUS.

## REPLY.

The question proposed is not peculiar to our own times; it has exercised the minds of Theologians for centuries. St. Alphonsus (*Theol. Moral. Lib. III., n. 527*) deals with it, and quotes or refers to at least twenty authors. It is obvious then, that we are treating with something difficult to determine. All will concur that it is possible to commit a venial sin of theft; and likewise, there is no dispute that sins of theft can be serious. The difficulty is to decide when precisely the sin would cease to be venial and become serious *ratione obiecti*, when there would be a grave violation of the virtue of commutative justice with the corresponding obligation of making restitution. Although some authors (v.g. Billuart, *De Jure et Justitia*, diss. 11, a. 3) held for only one standard, and that an absolute one, it is commonly accepted that the matter in a sin of theft may be grave a) relatively, that is with regard to the victim of the theft, and b) absolutely, or independently of the wealth or poverty of the person from whom the goods were stolen. As a practical norm, we would suggest for relatively grave matter that given by St. Alphonsus as the common teaching of the doctors: what would be sufficient for the daily support of a man and his family according to his station in life. Concerning absolute grave matter, the opinion appeals to us which was proposed some years ago by Fr. J. Arendt, S.J.:<sup>1</sup> the amount equivalent to the weekly wage of a skilled worker. The reasons for these opinions will, we hope, appear as we proceed.

The definitions of theft differ as to their mode of expression, but agree in this: that it is an unjust and secret taking of a neighbour's goods. We sometimes find the words added, "against his reasonable wishes"; but if he is not unwilling that we take his property, there is no

---

<sup>1</sup>*Nouvelle Revue Theologique.* 1926, pp. 123-132.

injustice done, according to the principle: *Scienti et volenti non fit iniuria*. The malice of theft consists in the violation of commutative justice, which dictates that each individual should have for his exclusive disposal those things which are his by right. A right may be voluntarily surrendered; and provided the owner does not object, and we have reason to believe that he does not or should not object, we do not act in opposition to his rights by taking his goods for our own use and advantage. On the other hand, if we have not his permission, explicit, implicit or reasonably presumed, we take away from him what is exclusively his, namely, the faculty to dispose of his own possessions as he desires. In other words, theft is a violation of the right of private ownership.

In order to estimate the gravity of the transgression of the moral law which is inherent in the sin of theft, it is well to consider how the right of private ownership is in harmony with the eternal law, how it contributes to the ordering of human life and activity towards our final end.

St. Thomas<sup>2</sup> teaches that the right of private ownership is something added to the natural law by the workings of human reason; in fact it is a right which is even necessary for human life. Three reasons are given by the Angelic Doctor for this statement. The first of these is that a man is naturally more careful and solicitous for what belongs to himself alone than for what he shares with many. Common ownership leads to neglect, a statement which is supported by the proverb: What is everybody's business is nobody's business. The second reason for the necessity of private ownership is to avoid the opposite extreme, that too many persons would be intent on the one thing with resultant confusion in Society. Finally, where several persons possess the same goods, disagreements are bound to arise with a violation of the peace; whereas there is peace and order when every man is content in the possession of what is his own. It follows that the right of private ownership is necessary for the good of society, that all things will be ordered properly and peacefully; and for the good of the individual, that satisfied and content with his own possessions, he will care for them and use them to best advantage for himself and his neighbour. An act of theft is a direct violation of this inherent right of private ownership, and does harm both to the person from whom the thing is stolen and also to the common good of society.

---

<sup>2</sup>S.T. 2a, 2ae, Q. 66, a. 2.

The gravity of the sin of theft will, therefore, be in proportion to the harm inflicted either on the victim of the sinful act or on society as a whole. To deprive a poor person of a rather small amount may cause him serious damage, although the effect on the community would be of trifling import. On the other hand, a rich man may not personally be put to much inconvenience if property to a considerable value were stolen from him; but at the same time, the common good would demand that such thefts be not committed with an easy conscience but should be forbidden under pain of serious sin and carry with them the grave obligation of making restitution. If the property of a wealthy man or company were open to the plunder of all and sundry, with no sufficient sanction in the moral law to restrain them, how long would the fabric of society endure? Thus the common distinction between absolutely grave matter and relatively grave matter in theft.

*Relatively grave matter.* Every act of theft, no matter how trifling be the object stolen, is a violation of our neighbour's rights and a sin against the virtue of commutative justice. It is possible that it also contains violations of some other virtue, for example charity or piety or religion. These, if present, may or may not be of serious import, but our concern now is with the sin against the seventh precept of the Decalogue, and our object is to discover when we would judge that a mortal sin had been committed by theft, apart from all other considerations. Justice has as its object the equality between external objects (*aequalitas rei ad rem*) between my goods and my neighbour's, that what I have corresponds to my rights and what he has likewise is in proper relation with his rights. When this equality has been seriously upset, then there has been a grave violation of justice. To judge when in fact there has been a serious disarrangement of equality between what is mine and what is my neighbour's, the only standard to which we can have recourse is the common opinion of prudent men. The subjective disappointment or distress at losing something which was held dear does not enter into consideration when the question is one of justice, which, as we remarked, concerns external equality and not personal feelings. What is the amount of a neighbour's goods which, if taken from him, would be in itself sufficient to do him serious harm? If we must have recourse to the prudent judgment of those capable of giving some direction, the first to be consulted are the Theologians who have devoted their talents and their attention to the study of human actions both good and bad, and whose works have at least the implicit approval of the Church, since

they are classed as *auctores probati*. Now, the common opinion of these doctors is that what would be sufficient to keep a man and his family in food, clothing, and shelter for one day is a matter of serious moment for him, its loss would cause him grave inconvenience and his unwillingness that he be deprived of it would be altogether reasonable. This norm has the advantage of being moderate and flexible. Most will agree that it does not err on the side of strictness, and so does not make for a multiplication of serious sins. Further, it does not determine a fixed sum, but is easily applicable to each case. Thus, to deprive an old-age pensioner these days of the equivalent of ten shillings would imply a serious loss, as it represents slightly more than his daily income. A workman on the basic wage or a tradesman who receives somewhat more may, we think, be presumed to spend most of his wages on the support of his family, and so a seventh part of his weekly wage would be grave matter if stolen from him—at the present day, something between thirty shillings and two pounds. Those in receipt of a higher income would normally adopt a higher standard of living, but we must not conclude that anything under their daily income would be only slight matter for theft. For one reason, the norm suggested is not what a man receives per day, but what it costs him to live according to his station in life; and for another reason, the daily income and, in some cases, the daily expenses may exceed what is called absolute matter.

*Grave matter absolutely considered.* As we have seen, a violation of commutative justice by theft not only involves an injury to the person whose goods are taken from him, but also inflicts a wound on the body social. Lesser injury to individuals may not affect the community as a whole, but the common good demands that there be some border line which may not be passed without incurring the guilt of mortal sin. What that amount may be cannot, of course, be stated with mathematical precision. We find that the amounts mentioned in the text books vary with the times in which their authors flourished and also according to the country in which they lived. From St. Alphonsus we would conclude that an amount equivalent to three *aurei* (about thirty shillings) would be certainly grave, though he himself favours a lesser sum (two *aurei*); if stolen even from a king. (Op. cit., n. 528). Ballerini-Palmieri (Theol. Moral. an. 1899. Vol. III, n. 282) puts the amount at about one hundred francs (four pounds), Lehmkühl (Theol. Moral. an. 1914, Vol. I, p. 633 not.) at thirty shillings to two pounds for England

and seven to ten dollars for America. Prummer (*Theol. Moral.* 1935, Vol. II, n. 80) would estimate the amount at a hundred francs (presumably the Swiss frs.). Fr. Damen (an. 1947, Vol. I, n. 77) repeats what he has in former editions—24 marks or 30 francs—but warns the reader that the amounts have to be adjusted to the altered value of money. The late Fr. Davis, S.J. (*Moral and Pastoral Theology*, 1946, Vol. II, p. 303) wrote: "We think...that now (an. 1945) £3 represents very accurately the absolute sum; it will not be much less; perhaps in the opinion of others it will be a little more". The same writer in his "Summary" published last year holds that a reasonable amount would be £8, but as wages increase, this sum would also increase. In Australian currency the sum would be about £10. Wages have increased since last year, and we may not be far wrong if we say the amount of £12 approx. is absolute matter at the present time (June, 1952).

The value of money is still fluctuating, and how long this estimate will remain approximately correct is a matter of speculation: it may be out of date before these pages reach our readers. We are inclined therefore to accept the suggestions of Father Arendt referred to in our opening paragraph, that absolute grave matter would be the weekly income of the mass of workers who are skilled at their occupation, but require no great intellectual education to follow their pursuits. This amount is something over and above the basic wage fixed by the competent authority—say about £12 Australian currency. Fr. Arnedt maintains that a study of the estimates of approved authors over a long period shows that their estimate of absolute grave matter in theft is roughly five times relatively grave matter in the case of an artisan, or five times his daily cost of living. Perhaps it should be seven times that amount to have the theory accurate, but we are not dealing with mathematics. It is scarcely a mere coincidence that Father Davis' opinion (£8 stg. or £10 A.) should be approximately the basic wage.

In conclusion we offer this as a considered opinion: Absolute grave matter for the sin of theft is something in excess of the ruling basic wage. We think it will be agreed that society would suffer serious harm if it were permissible for any one to appropriate what is equivalent of the product of a week's industrious labour and not be guilty of a serious violation of the moral law in the matter of justice, and not be bound by a grave obligation to repair the damage done by making restitution.

## ROTARY CLUBS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A parishioner recently arrived from another Diocese is a member of Rotary. He surprised me by telling me that in his former place of residence the works undertaken by himself and some of his fellow Rotarians, amongst whom were prominent Catholics, aided and supported non-Catholic sects. Would you please let me know what attitude is to be adopted towards Rotary, and whether it is lawful for its Catholic members to engage in such activities?

COUNTRY PAROCHUS.

## REPLY.

We have taken the liberty to re-cast somewhat the question submitted, but hope that the reply will contain the information sought by our esteemed correspondent. There are two questions:

1. What attitude is to be adopted towards Rotary?
2. Is it lawful for a Catholic member to join his fellow Rotarians in activities which give support and help to non-Catholic religious organisations?

1. We believe the attitude to be adopted towards Rotary, in so far as membership of the laity in these parts is concerned, is one of respectful toleration. Rotary, as is well known, is an international Association of professional and business men. It originated in America (Chicago) in the year 1905, and quickly spread to other countries. At present it is said to have over 350,000 members who belong to over 80 different nationalities. Its primary purpose is to be of service to the community by promoting friendship, progress in the various professions and useful vocations, general prosperity and a spirit of peace and brotherly regard among all peoples. It professes to be non-political and regards all religions as good: it excludes no member because of his religious convictions or lack of them. Its character is thus non-religious. And herein, unless we are mistaken, lies the centre of the big objection that may be made against it. The ideals of Rotary are purely those of the natural order. Truly, the natural virtues are not to be despised; they are qualities of human nature at its best, when unaided by grace and revelation, and they are the basis of the supernatural. We must not, however, overlook the fact that God has elevated man to the supernatural state and our purpose in life is not fulfilled if we confine ourselves to what is merely natural. Rotary does not take into account our complete destiny, and so there is a wide gap between Rotary at its

best and the Christian manner of life. We have written "Rotary at its best", because the spirit of the Association and its branches will inevitably be influenced by those who are actually responsible for its continued existence and activity. There is always the possibility that such influence, while not necessarily for evil, will not be an inspiration to the things that are above, where Christ is at the Right Hand of the Father. We may compare the fellowship promoted by Rotary and ideal Christian association with education given without religion in a public school and education which is religious in character, keeping in view not merely earthly happiness but the glory that shall be revealed in us when we see God face to face. The philosophy of supporters of secular education and the ideals of Rotary seem to have this in common: they overlook the important fact that man is not merely a rational animal in need of human sympathy and aspiring to earthly felicity. They do not stress the great truth that each human being is made unto the image and likeness of God, redeemed by the precious Blood of our divine Lord and a potential if not an actual member of the mystical Body of Christ, whose first concern should be for the means to reach his eternal destiny.

Another danger is that Rotary in its workings is philanthropic rather than charitable in the Christian sense, and that a Catholic may become so caught up in what appeals to his instincts prompting him to come to the aid of his fellow man, that he will put man before God, misunderstanding the words of St. James: "Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation", and forget that the Apostle adds the words: "and to keep one's self unspotted from this world".

There have been two Roman Decrees on the subject of Rotary. The first was from the S. Consistorial Congregation (4th February, 1929) by which it was declared inexpedient for Ordinaries to permit their Clergy to become members of Rotary. Nothing was said about the position of the laity. As far as we are aware, the Bishops in Australia issued no instructions on the matter and individual Catholics were not forbidden or, generally speaking, dissuaded from joining Rotary. Last year (11th January, 1951) there emanated from the Holy Office a decree which reads thus: "It is not lawful for clerics to become members of the Association known as the Rotary Club or to take part in its meetings; the laity, however, are exhorted to keep the injunction of canon 684 of the Code of Canon Law".

The position as present is: 1) The clergy are forbidden to be mem-

bers of Rotary and to take part in its meetings. One reason which suggests itself is that the cleric by his profession is expected to base his life on a realisation of the supernatural, while Rotary would seem to find sufficient fulfilment of human aspirations in what is natural. We may note that by "meetings of the Rotary Club" only meetings which are exclusively for members are intended, and not assemblies or entertainments, lectures, etc., organised by Rotary for the benefit of the public in general.

2. The laity are to be exhorted—a word which does not contain a command but implies that they should be counselled—to observe the law of the canon which warns them against Societies which are secret, condemned, seditious or suspect, or strive to withdraw from the legitimate vigilance of the Church. Among all these epithets, the harshest which, as far as we can judge, may be applied to Rotary as it is known here, is that it may be suspect. Whether it actually be so, is for the Ordinary to decide for his Diocese, and in the absence of such a declaration, we may conclude that he does not regard it as constituting a notable danger to the faith or morals of his subjects. With regard to the parish Priest: he is not a legislator and cannot make laws binding in conscience; at most he can and should give the advice he considers opportune for the good of his own parishioners, referring doubtful cases to the decision of the Bishop. While a priest may feel it incumbent on him to counsel one of his parishioners against joining Rotary, he is not entitled—unless there be some particular enactment for the Diocese—to declare membership of Rotary a thing forbidden by the Church's laws.

3. The answer to the second question will depend on the nature and extent of the support given to non-Catholic religious organisations. If it be assistance offered to what is called a charitable institution which has for its purpose the alleviation of distress—an orphanage, hospital or home for the aged—but conducted by the representatives of a Protestant religion, it is hard to condemn such assistance as giving approval to the religious tenets of the persons responsible for the institution. To be one of a "working-bee" which would devote its energies to the erection or repair of a Protestant Church may be more difficult to excuse, for such a building has for its purpose the worship of God, according to a manner which must be condemned by Catholics as superstition. Furthermore, there is also the question of scandal to be considered and the possibility of giving the impression that one Religion is as good as another. It is not impossible to imagine that a non-Catholic Church building is regard-

ed not so much as a place of worship, but as an edifice which lends dignity to the locality, and for some good reason, religion apart, should be kept respectable and in good repair. Also, it may be that in certain circumstances the presence of a Catholic man would be taken merely as a sign of ordinary neighbourly feeling, without any approval of the false worship. Nevertheless, we think that as a safe rule, the Catholic Rotarian should abstain from joining his fellows in activities which are closely related to non-Catholic religious interests.

\*

\*

\*

\*

### CONFESSIONS OF RELIGIOUS SISTERS IN A CHURCH.

Dear Rev. Sir,

During the absence of the Parish Priest, another is sent to supply the Sunday Masses, etc. When he arrives, the Rev. Mother of the local convent informs him that the sisters have not had the usual opportunities for confession, and requests him to hear the community in the Parish Church.

1. The visiting priest knows he can hear the confession of an individual sister who requests him, but can he hear the confessions of the community, as a community?

2. Can any priest with diocesan Faculties hear the confessions of a community of sisters, simply by telling them to come to him in the Parish Church?

CURATE.

### REPLY.

1. The visiting priest, if requested to hear the confessions of the community, does not act validly. It may happen that each sister will ask him either directly or through the Superior to hear her confession, and thus he will actually hear the whole community, and give valid and lawful absolution.

2. The confessions of a community of sisters cannot be heard validly by the simple expedient of asking them to come to the Parish Church.

A priest requires special jurisdiction for the confessions of religious women. (Can. 876, p. 1.) Outside the cases mentioned in Law, this jurisdiction is given by the local Ordinary. The ordinary, extraordinary and supplementary confessors have it habitually for the religious house (convent) to which they are appointed: their faculties

are for the benefit of the community, and so every sister of the community may confess validly to them. The special jurisdiction for confessions of religious women is, in some instances, given by the Law itself, but the priest does not possess it habitually; he receives it *per modum actus* for the particular confession, when the circumstances and conditions of the Law have been verified.

Our correspondent has in mind can. 522, which reads:

If, notwithstanding the provisions of cann. 520 and 521 (which treat of ordinary, extra-ordinary, and supplementary confessors and also for a special confessor for a particular religious), any religious, for the peace of her conscience, approach (*adeat*) a confessor approved by the local Ordinary for the confessions of women, the confession is valid and lawful if made in any church or oratory, even a semi-public oratory.....

With regard to this canon we may note a) that the place where the confession may validly and lawfully be heard includes not only a church, etc., but also any other place lawfully designated, even for this occasion, for confessions of women (Pont. Comm. for Interpret. of the Code, 24 Nov., 1920, 12 February, 1935), and b) the usual confessional of the sisters, though not erected in their oratory, comes within the meaning of the canon. (cf. Pont. Comm. 28 Dec., 1927). The idea of taking the sisters to the parish church, though ingenious, is unnecessary—their own confessional would be sufficient, other requirements being fulfilled, to secure the validity of the confession.

What is more important is the word *adeat*, which we have rendered *approach*. It is in the singular and its nominative is *aliqua religiosa*. The request for the ministrations of the priest as a confessor must come from the sister herself, though it could well be communicated to him by any third party, even the Rev. Mother. But if the priest, the Rev. Mother or any one else independently of the sister, makes arrangements for the priest not approved for religious women to hear her confession, the sacrament is invalid for lack of jurisdiction. We may say, then, that if the priest were to set up his tribunal in the convent chapel or the church, and let it be known that he would hear the confessions of the community, the absolutions would be invalid. On the other hand, if the sisters were informed that the priest would be hearing confessions in the church at a certain hour and any sister who wished had permission to leave the convent at that time; or he would be at the convent, and it was free for each sister to ask him to hear her confession, then the request for confession would come from the individual sister and the sacrament would be valid.

JAMES MADDEN.

# Cannon Law

## I. RE-VALIDATION OF MARRIAGE—CATHOLIC UPBRINGING OF CHILDREN.

Dear Reverend Sir,

A Protestant man and a Catholic woman were married outside the Church. Their children have been christened and brought up in the Church of England. This has not been for want of effort on the part of the Catholic party, but the husband has been adamant in his demand that all the children should be brought up as Protestants. Much unhappiness has resulted from the divergence of religious views on the part of the husband and wife. Due to pressure exercised by her husband, the wife had not attended Mass for several years. Now the children are growing up.

Recently the wife has commenced to attend Mass. This has occurred as the result of greater courage and initiative on her part, but also on account of the more tolerant attitude of her husband. There is no doubt that she is truly repentant for what has gone before. In a more mellow frame of mind, the husband is now somewhat co-operative in matters religious. After several discussions with the priest, he has gone so far as to say that, if any more children were born of their union, the mother could have them as Catholics. No doubt he regrets much of what has gone before. He has said that if he could have his time over he would let her have all the children her way. Despite these sentiments, he will not tolerate any change in regard to the children who are being brought up as Protestants.

In regard to a renewal of matrimonial consent, it is unlikely that he will agree. He has not refused definitely, but there is little hope that he will be willing. If he refuses, I propose to seek a *Sanatio in radice*, but what about the Catholic upbringing of their children?

THOMAS.

### REPLY.

Subject to the Ordinary's judgment, it would appear that the necessary conditions are verified for granting a dispensation from mixed religion with a view to renewal of consent, or for the Ordinary's granting a *Sanatio in radice*.

#### *Renewal of Consent.*

As one of the conditions for a dispensation from the impediment of

mixed religion, Canon 1061, paragraph 1, requires that "the non-Catholic party shall have given a guarantee to remove all danger of perversion from the Catholic party and both parties shall have given guarantees to baptise and educate all the children in the Catholic faith alone". A difficulty of interpretation arose in respect of the word "all"—"de universa prole". No doubt the primary purpose of this expression was to exclude such agreements as those by which boys would be brought up in one religion, and girls in another. But, the use of this word "universa" gave rise to some doubt in other cases, for example, where a non-Catholic party had been married previously and already had children by the previous marriage; likewise, in cases where the parties to a marriage already had had offspring which might not be in their effective control. This doubt was settled by a reply of the Holy Office issued in 1942. The Holy Office was asked:—

- (i) Whether promises which must be given according to Canon 1061, to have all children baptised and educated only in the Catholic Church, include only children to be born, or also children already born before the marriage.

Reply:—In the affirmative to the first part, in the negative to the second.

- (ii) What is to be thought of marriages celebrated with promises only as to future children without mention of children already born?

Reply:—This is provided for in the reply to the first question.

The mind of the Sacred Congregation is then explained. Although per se, according to the Canon cited, promises are not required as regards children already born before the celebration of marriage, yet the parties to the marriage are by all means to be warned of their grave obligation under the Divine Law to see to the Catholic education also of children who are already born.

In the present case it seems that the religious upbringing of children who may be born in the future is suitably safeguarded. It is assumed that guarantees will be given in regard to them. As far as the children already born are concerned, the wife should be apprised of the obligation of which, no doubt, she is only too conscious, to care by every suitable means possible for their Catholic upbringing, even though, in practice, there seems little hope of her achieving this objective.

*Sanatio in Radice.*

A change of considerable importance has been introduced in the

faculty which the Australian Bishops enjoy to grant a *Sanatio in Radice* to mixed marriages. As a result of which the faculty would be applicable in the case under consideration, whereas previously such a case would have been excluded by the fact that children who had been born of the marriage would not be brought up as Catholics.

In a letter sent by the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda to the Ordinaries of Australia, on July 2nd, 1930, a restriction was applied to the faculty which those Ordinaries enjoyed under certain circumstances of applying the *Sanatio in radice* to mixed marriages. No *Sanatio in radice* could be granted in the future "unless it is morally certain that the non-Catholic party will not impede the Catholic education of any of the children who are born or yet to be born". In the *Formula Maior* of Apostolic Faculties, issued to the Ordinaries of Australia and New Zealand in 1941, this restrictive clause was retained in the faculty to grant a *Sanatio in mixed marriages*. In the renewed form of *Formula Maior* which was issued in 1951, this restrictive clause had been removed. As a result, provided that other conditions are verified, a *Sanatio in radice* could be applied by the Ordinary in the case under consideration.

\* \* \* \*

## II. CHOICE OF CONFESSOR BY EXEMPT RELIGIOUS PRIEST.

Dear Reverend Sir,

Father A.B., a priest in an exempt clerical institute, has prolonged leave of absence from his Monastery, in order to receive medical care in a place which, climatically, is suited to his complaint. While a patient in this place, he has limited opportunities of meeting priests who have faculties from the local Ordinary to hear confessions. However, not infrequently, he meets other priests from other dioceses or from other Orders, who are sojourning in the same place for medical attention, or on vocation. Can it be arranged in some way that he have a privilege of selecting a confessor for himself on any occasion on which he wishes to confess. Some senior members of the Institute, who spent their early days in Europe, spoke of such a privilege which used to be enjoyed by all members of the Society. I have not heard of this privilege in recent years.

REGULAR.

## REPLY.

The religious superior, who, according to the Constitutions, may grant delegated jurisdiction for hearing the confessions of his subjects, could empower Father A.B. to choose any of these priests as his personal Confessor, on the understanding that such choice would automatically confer faculties upon the priest chosen. Provision should be made that priests chosen in this way should fulfil the requirement of Canon 877, namely, they should have established their suitability by examination. In practice, no doubt, it would be found that most, if not all, of these priests already exercise the faculties in their own diocese or in their own order, and therefore they would be eligible in terms of this Canon. However, as far as validity is concerned, the priest chosen by Father A.B. would not be required to have faculties from his own Ordinary, or from his own religious superior.

The Code requires as a condition for validity that jurisdiction to hear confessions must be granted expressly, either orally or in writing. (Canon 879, paragraph 1.) The term "expressly" does not mean that the delegation must be given explicitly.

Thus, appointment by the Ordinary to an office which by law or custom includes the hearing of confession, includes implicitly the granting of jurisdiction for these confessions; for example, it is commonly held that if a Bishop commissions a priest to give a mission in a certain parish, by that very fact he also grants him faculties to hear confessions in that parish. Likewise, jurisdiction may be delegated indirectly and still be given expressly as required by the Canon, as for example, in the case under consideration. Capello observes that the Ordinary may even empower the person who is not capable of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, for example, the Superior of a Convent of Sisters, to designate a priest, who would have his faculties to hear confessions by the very fact of that designation. Thus, for example, it can be arranged that all priests who are permitted by the Superior to offer Mass in the Chapel of the religious, would by that very fact have jurisdiction to hear confessions conferred on them by the Ordinary.

No privilege is required in order that such an arrangement could be made. It would be, simply, an application of the rules contained in Canon Law.

*Itinerant Religious.*

The privilege to which certain senior members of the Institute have referred was a pre-code institution. Originally religious men living in

monasteries were required to confess, either to their own proper superior, or to some confessor lawfully designated by him. Otherwise, their confession was not only unlawful, but also invalid. When travelling outside his monastery, the religious was permitted to confess to his travelling priest companion (*Socius idoneus eiusdem ordinis*). Failing him, he could confess to some other priest, religious or secular. The jurisdiction of the confessor selected in this way by the itinerant religious was derived from a tacit delegation of the Superior, according to the Constitutions. Strangely enough, the restriction of jurisdiction was referred to as a "privilege".

It appears that this arrangement has been abrogated by the Code of Canon Law, by reason of the fact that jurisdiction to hear confessions must be granted expressly, either by word or in writing. Furthermore, in the Code provision is made for Cardinals and Bishops to select a confessor who, if he has not jurisdiction, by the very fact of his being selected, obtains the required jurisdiction. There is no similar provision for clerical exempt religious.

\*

\*

\*

\*

### III. DISPARITY OF CULT—PROOFS REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH NULLITY OF MARRIAGE.

Dear Reverend Sir,

A certain man, whom we may call John, was born of a Catholic father and a non-Catholic mother. He was baptised in the Catholic Church, and, apparently, the intention of the parents was that he be brought up as a Catholic. Unfortunately, his father died while he was an infant and his mother took the child to live with her family. As a result, the child was never brought up as a Catholic. Whatever religious upbringing he had was in a non-Catholic sect. In due course he married a non-Catholic in a non-Catholic Church. This marriage ended unhappily and a civil divorce has been obtained. Subsequently John became attached to a Catholic girl. His case was submitted to the Ordinary, with a view to his being declared free to marry, but, quite correctly, his application was refused, because, although baptised in the Catholic Church, he was brought up from infancy in the non-Catholic religion, and, therefore, is not bound by the Canonical form of marriage.

It has been represented to me by certain colleagues that his marriage could be invalid on account of an impediment of disparity of cult, because the divorced wife was not baptised. Would you kindly

advise me if such is the case. If your reply is in the affirmative, would you indicate what proofs I should endeavour to obtain for presentation to the Ordinary. Finally, will it be necessary for the other party, namely, the divorced wife, to take part in the proceedings?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

It is true that there may be grounds for a declaration of nullity of John's marriage by reason of an impediment of disparity of cult. Before the Code of Canon Law came into force the matrimonial impediment of disparity of cult existed between two parties of whom one was validly baptised and the other unbaptised. After the Code, this impediment was restricted to marriages between persons baptised in the Catholic Church or converts to the Catholic Church from heresy or schism, and non-baptised persons (Canon 1070). In a certain strict theological sense, all persons who are validly baptised are baptised into the Catholic Church because the Church has exclusive jurisdiction in regard to the Sacraments. It is plain, however, that the words "baptised in the Catholic Church", as used in Canon 1070, are used in a more restricted sense and apply to persons who by their baptism have been formally aggregated to the Catholic Church by reason of the intention of the Minister, the subject, or, if the subject be an infant, of parents or guardians.

A difficulty of interpretation arose in regard to such people as the man who figures in the present case. In virtue of Canon 1099, paragraph 2, persons who are baptised in the Catholic Church, but who from infancy were brought up outside the Catholic religion are exempted from the law of Canonical Form. It could be argued by parity that, likewise, such people were exempted from the impediment of disparity of cult. This doubt was resolved by an official reply of the Commission of Interpretation of the Code. It was asked whether the persons born of non-Catholics mentioned in Canon 1099, paragraph 2, are bound according to Canon 1070 by the impediment of disparity of cult when they contract marriage with an unbaptised person. The reply was given in the affirmative.

Therefore, a marriage contracted by John with an un-baptised person would be invalid by reason of the impediment of disparity of cult.  
*Proofs required for Decree of Nullity.*

It will be necessary to furnish proof of the Catholic baptism of John and of the non-Baptism of his partner. The fact that their

marriage was contracted outside the Church, and that John was a non-Catholic in the case would afford ample proof that no dispensation from the diriment impediment had been granted. Therefore, the greatest task of proof will be to establish the non-Baptism of the wife. The establishment of a negative fact, such as absence of Baptism, is fraught with particular difficulties, but is by no means impossible. It will be necessary to find witnesses who are able to give evidence, particularly in regard to the infancy of the person concerned. It will be for the ecclesiastical Judge to evaluate the evidence which they may give. In the Judge's interrogation of such witnesses, his first line of inquiry would concern the religious background of the parents and family of the person concerned. It may be that the parents belong to a sect which does not believe in, or does not practise, infant Baptism. If the parents were active members of this sect, there is an initial presumption in favour of the alleged non-Baptism of one of the children. Likewise, if they were members of a religious sect in which the ritual employed for Baptism does not contain the essentials of the matter and form of the Sacrament, it is more easy to establish that valid Baptism was not conferred upon their offspring. In some cases the religious indifference of the parents is the sole cause of their omitting baptism of the infant. Again, it may be that one parent is very antagonistic to religion generally. Sometimes, too, the sharp difference between husband and wife in the matter of religion may result in the foolish compromise of having none of the children baptised in any Church. It may be a relevant consideration as to which of the parents had the greater part in the upbringing.

In exploring the possibilities of the person's having been baptised in infancy, an important consideration is whether the child was ever entrusted to the care of others, particularly in circumstances of illness. In such a case, it will be necessary to ascertain who was responsible for the child during that period and whether or not such a person may have taken steps to have the infant baptised.

Apart from the religious affiliations of the parents, or their religious indifference, there may have been other reasons for omitting baptism. For example, they may have lived in a remote district, a long distance from a Church. In such a case it will be of interest to ascertain who were the travelling Ministers of religion who called, and of what denomination were they, and what was their practice in regard to baptising infants. Occasionally, in cases where people lived remote from settle-

ment, and especially if they were in circumstances of poverty, their neglect even to register children confirms the allegation that the children were not baptised.

It will be necessary to investigate the Baptism or non-Baptism of other members of the family. If some were baptised and others were not, it will be relevant to ascertain the reason for these differences. Especially if a member of the family older than the one in question, and another immediately younger have been baptised, there will be the greater need to explain the omission of baptism in regard to the one concerned.

A search should be made in the records of Churches in the district in which a person was born, or in which she lived as an infant. Although the result of these searches is not conclusive, it may confirm the allegations of witnesses.

If it is a matter of preparing an affidavit for someone who will not come before the ecclesiastical Judge, the priest who assists in the preparation of the affidavit should have these and similar points before his notice. It is important to consider and properly to evaluate many details of information. The absence of religious upbringing in the person concerned may be a confirmation of the omission of baptism in his infancy. Likewise, his attitude to the baptism of his own offspring, reflecting as it does his ideas as to the importance of Baptism, may bear out the story of religious indifference in the family.

From what has been said to date, it will be clear that the co-operation of the other party in this case must be sought. In the first place, it will be necessary to investigate the possibility of her having been baptised in adult age. She is most competent to depose in regard to this. Further, in order to fulfil the requirements of procedural law, it will be necessary for her to be cited to appear before the ecclesiastical Judge. Although it is not impossible that a case would be proved even without her co-operation, it is safe to say that her unwillingness to depose or to be interviewed would make the case much more difficult of proof.

JAMES CARROLL.

# Liturgy

## FERIAL MASS ON FIRST CLASS FEAST DURING LENT

Dear Rev. Sir,

On Mondays I say Mass for my nuns to renew the Sacred Species, the parish normally going without Mass on that day. This year, St. Patrick's Day fell on a Monday, and considering that a sufficient reason to binate, I said Mass for the faithful—where the nuns attended—and later at the convent. I followed the *Ordo* and said the Mass of St. Patrick (double of the first class) in both places. Considering the fact that my nuns are bound to recite the Divine Office, should I have said the Mass of the Feria in the Convent?

MONACHUS.

### REPLY.

We are not familiar with the precise terms of the faculty to celebrate two Masses on week days enjoyed by our correspondent, but it is presumably similar to the faculty granted to the Archbishop of Cincinnati in 1948, which permitted the celebration of a second Mass on week days on the occasion of a wedding or funeral, or for the renewal of the Sacred Species in oratories of monasteries (cfr. *Ephem. liturg.* lxiii (1949), p. 326. The faculty was given because of the shortage of priests and was to be used only in cases of real necessity.

The circumstances mentioned in the present query do not appear to measure up to a case of real necessity. Canon Law requires that in places where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, Mass should be celebrated *regularly* at least once a week (can. 1265). The law, then, by the use of the word *regularly*, allows for the omission of Mass in one or other week, as such an omission does not exclude the regular practice. The providing of a Mass for the parishioners on the feast of St. Patrick would surely be sufficient cause to justify the exceptional omission of Mass in the convent.

MONACHUS acted correctly in saying the Mass of St. Patrick in the convent. Since the nuns are bound to the recitation of the Divine Office in choir, they should have each day, as far as is possible, the Conventual Mass (Can. 610, § 2). As a general rule there is only one Conventual Mass on each day and this corresponds to the Office of the day. On certain days the rubrics require two Conventual Masses in some churches, one to be celebrated in choir and the other outside of choir.

So for example, when a double of the first or second class occurs on a week-day during Lent, the Mass of the feast is celebrated in choir, and the Mass of the feria outside of choir. If, however, the feast is of lesser rank, namely, a double major or minor or a semi-double, then, the Mass of the feria is celebrated in choir, and the Mass of the feast out of choir. In churches which have only one Conventual Mass, on the weekdays of Lent, after Ash Wednesday, and of Passion Week, on the days of Quarter Tense in Advent and September, on common vigils and on Rogation Monday, if there is no procession, the Conventual Mass is arranged as follows:—

a) On doubles of the first and second class, and during the octaves of the Epiphany and Corpus Christi the Mass is of the feast, with a commemoration of the feria and, except on doubles of the first class, of the vigil;

b) on doubles major and minor and on semidoubles the Mass is of the feria or vigil, with a commemoration of the feast;

c) if a feria and a vigil coincide, the Mass is of the feria with commemorations of the feast, of the vigil, and any other commemorations that may occur (cfr. *Addit. et variat.*, i. 4).

\*

\* \*

\*

\*

#### MODIFICATION OF PRAYERS IN REQUIEM MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

In the Missa Quotidiana, when the names of the deceased are not specifically known, the second prayer is to be recited first and a prayer *ad lib.* in the second place. I always make the *ad lib.* prayer the prayer for deceased father and mother. But, in that Secret, the words are used, 'which I offer for the souls of my father and mother, etc.' As the Mass is not for them should these words be omitted, and, if so, how would the Secret run?

A COUNTRY PAROCHUS.

#### REPLY.

If the Mass is offered for the dead in general the prayers are recited in the order and form given in the Missa quotidiana. If the Mass is offered for certain determined persons whose description is also known, e.g., one or more men, the first prayer will be the appropriate prayer among the *Orationes diversae*, the second prayer *ad libitum*, and the third prayer *Fidelium*. If, however, the Mass is offered for certain de-

terminated persons whose description is not known, e.g., according to the intention of the donor of the stipend but it is unknown whether they be men or women, then the first prayer will be *Deus veniæ largitor*, the second *ad libitum*, and the third *Fidelium*. In a Missa quotidiana which is not sung the celebrant may add other prayers for the dead, provided the total number does not exceed seven, is uneven, and the *Fidelium* is recited in the last place.

In regard to the text of the prayers, no modifications may be made by the Celebrant beyond those provided for in the Missal itself, which makes allowance for variations in number, gender, rank, etc., of persons. The apparent difficulty arising from the words of the secret prayer is no different from that which may be drawn from the words of the prayer recited at the offering of the host in every Mass. The secondary intention of the Celebrant is understood to be without prejudice to the primary intention for the application of the Mass on some special title, as, for instance, the intention of the donor of the stipend. Some theologians teach that the Mass is as profitable for each of several for whom it is offered as it would be if offered for one person only. This opinion, while not the more common one, is not devoid of probability, and for this reason it is usually recommended that the priest should have a secondary intention when offering the Holy Sacrifice.

\*

\*

\*

\*

#### FORTY HOURS' PRAYER—TIME OF EXPOSITION— VOTIVE MASSES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you kindly answer the following question concerning the Forty Hours' Exposition:—

1. What rubrics regulate the Exposition?
2. Must the Blessed Sacrament be exposed for forty hours?
3. When is it permissible to say the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament?

AMOVIBILIS.

#### REPLY.

1. The rules for the Forty Hours' Prayer were first issued in 1592 by Pope Clement VIII, in His Instruction '*Graves et diuturnæ*', which regulated its celebration in the churches of Rome. In 1731 Pope Clement XII reissued the Instruction as we have it to-day. The Instruction is binding only in Rome and in any diocese whose Ordinary may

have imposed it. The Sacred Congregation of Rites, however, has several times manifested its wish that the Clementine Instruction should be regarded everywhere as the norm for the observance of the Forty Hours' Prayer. The Instruction requires the continuous exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance from the Mass of Exposition until the Mass of Deposition on the third day.

The exact fulfilment of all the conditions of the Instruction was often very difficult, if not impossible, and the Holy See received numerous requests for relaxation of certain requirements, especially the nocturnal adoration. Consequently, on 22nd January, 1914, Pope Pius X, by Decree of the Holy Office, extended the indulgences and privilege to the modified form of the Prayer. The Decree stated that, wherever, in the opinion of the local Ordinary, it is not possible to observe the prescriptions of the Clementine Instruction for the Forty Hours' Prayer, it is sufficient, in order to gain the benefits of the indulgences and the privileged Altar, to expose the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance at any hour of the morning or about noon on the first day, and, the exposition having continued throughout that day and in like manner on the following day, to depose It at noon or in the evening of the third day, even though the exposition is interrupted at night (cfr. *A.A.S.*, VI (1914), p. 74).

The Sacred Congregation of Rites, in a rescript dated the 30th June, 1887, granted to the Bishops of Australia the faculty to permit exposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament *ad instar* of the Forty Hours' Prayer without the Mass being sung with Deacon and Subdeacon, but with the use of incense, and even though the Blessed Sacrament be replaced in the tabernacle during the night; provided that (*dummodo*) everything else be carried out according to the Clementine Instruction (cfr. *Australasian Catholic Directory*, 1888, p. 49). The IV Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand repeated the permission to interrupt the exposition during the night and also added that Benediction should be given each evening before the Blessed Sacrament is replaced in the tabernacle (Decree 545).

From the above legislation it may be deduced that it is for the local Ordinary to decide whether the Clementine Instruction must be observed, with or without the relaxations permitted by the Rescript of 1887. He may regulate the Prayer, determining the Masses to be celebrated as votive Masses *pro re gravi et publica simul causa*, the hours of exposition, manner of concluding the Prayer, etc.

2. The Decree of 1914 granting the indulgences to the modified form of the Forty Hours' Prayer, without the nocturnal exposition, did not require that the Blessed Sacrament should be exposed for the full forty hours. Likewise the Rescript of 1887 allowed the suspension of the exposition at night, but directed that the Clementine Instruction be followed for the rest, i.e., a Mass of Exposition and Deposition, which arrangement scarcely permits the full forty hours. The observance of the full forty hours is, then, not necessary for the gaining of the indulgences.

3. The liturgical privileges attached by the Clementine Instruction to the Solemn Masses of the Forty Hours' Prayer are retained, according to most authors, only when the Prayer is carried out exactly according to the rules of the Instruction, or with the concessions granted by special Indults of the Holy See. In so far as the rubrics allow, the Instruction requires the celebration of the votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament at the opening and closing of the Prayer, and the *Missa pro pace*, or any other Mass ordered by the local Ordinary, on the second day. These votive Masses are regarded as votive Masses *pro re gravi et publica simul causa*. On certain days, however, such votive Masses are forbidden. The following table sets out the rules for these Masses.

#### I. THE VOTIVE MASSES, WHEN PERMITTED.

##### A) The Mass of the Blessed Sacrament.

- i. The votive Mass as in the Missal for Feria V. White vestments.
- ii. *Gloria* and Creed are said.
- iii. Commemorations are made of:—
  - a) Double of II class.
  - b) Any Sunday (even anticipated).
  - c) Any feast of the Lord, e.g., the Dedication of a church. (This commemoration precedes that of a minor Sunday or Vigil of Epiphany).
  - d) Greater ferias, i.e., ferias of Lent, Advent, Quarter Tense, Monday of Rogations.
  - e) Vigil of Epiphany or privileged octaves, i.e., Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany, Christmas, Ascension.
  - f) *Oratio imperata pro re gravi* is said.
- iv. Preface of Christmas.
- v. Last Gospel of St. John, unless a Sunday, feria, vigil, octave or feast which has a proper Gospel is commemorated, in which case the proper Gospel is read at the end of Mass.

B) The *Missa pro pace*.

- i. Votive Mass as in the Missal. Violet vestments.
- ii. *Gloria* is omitted, but the Creed is said.
- iii. Commemorations are as above in A, iii.
- iv. Prayer of the Blessed Sacrament is added, after the above commemorations but before the *Oratio imperata pro re gravi*, if it is said, unless a commemoration has been made of an identical mystery, i.e., feasts of Corpus Christi, the Passion, the Cross, the Most Holy Redeemer, the Most Sacred Heart and the Most Precious Blood.
- v. The Preface is not proper, and will be that of an occurring commemoration that may have a proper Preface, or of the season, or the common Preface.
- vi. The last Gospel is of St. John, unless it is proper as above in A, v.

## II. WHEN VOTIVE MASSES ARE FORBIDDEN.

## A) The Mass of Blessed Sacrament.

- i. The votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament is forbidden on the following days:—
  - a) Sundays of I class, i.e., first of Advent, first of Lent to Low Sunday inclusive, Pentecost.
  - b) Doubles of I class.
  - c) Privileged ferias, i.e., Ash Wednesday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Holy Week.
  - d) Privileged vigils, i.e., Christmas and Pentecost.
  - e) All Souls' Day.
  - f) Any day in which there is an office or commemoration, or vigil or day within an octave (even a simple octave) of an identical mystery of the Lord as above in B, iv.

On these days the Mass of the day is said (the colour of the Vestments being the colour of the day) with the prayers from the impeded Mass of the Blessed Sacrament added to the prayers of the Mass *under one conclusion*, except when the Mass of the day is of an identical mystery or of All Souls' Day, on which days the prayer is omitted. The Creed is said. The Preface is of the Mass of the day, or, if it has no proper Preface, the Preface of Christmas. The last Gospel will be that of the impeded votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, unless the strictly proper Gospel of a commemorated Sunday, feria, vigil or octave must be read.

B) The *Missa pro pace*.

The votive Mass *pro pace* is forbidden on the days enumerated above in A, i (a-e). On such days the Mass is that of the day (with vestments of the corresponding colour). The prayers of the impeded votive Mass *pro pace* are added to the prayers of the Mass *under one conclusion*. The prayer from the Mass of the Blessed Sacrament is added, after the commemorations required by the rubrics but before the *Oratio imperata pro re gravi* if it is said, unless the Mass of the day or a commemoration be of an identical mystery. The Creed is sung. The Preface is of the Mass of the day. The last Gospel is of St. John, unless an occurring proper Gospel must be read.

P. L. MURPHY.

\*

\*

\*

\*

## SHORT NOTICE.

REPROACHFULLY YOURS, by Lucile Hasley (Sheed & Ward, 1951). 128 pp. 10/6 (Eng.).

Let the first remark be made as calmly as possible: Remove the dust cover, and forget it. Three worried women deep in the prayer of petition—and looking as grotesque as any maker of comic strips could desire. It is wanting in good taste. That has been the impact on the sensibilities of more than one reader. Due sympathy is allowed, of course, to the struggling artist in search of some sparks of humour. An assignment on these matters must be very difficult. (Just how does the artist bring it off so delightfully in the sketches on Our Parish in the Australian Messenger?)

Having forgotten the dust cover on Mrs. Hasley's book, one opens it (still with trepidation, it must be confessed) and suffers the slight recoil, expected. A scrap of dialogue starts up: "I got a prospect for you, Father . . ." However, the recoil must be overcome with gratitude in the thought that it could have been, "gotta". True, that is not Mrs. Hasley's diction—she is a woman of education; and—let it be said at once—an observant and thoughtful writer. But the bait is often too facetious. At least that is how some Australians will feel it in spite of the high praise by Catholic journals in America, where it was written.

But there is so much interesting writing, informed with truth and humour, that we ought to persevere and skip *none* of it. This will certainly not be done at one sitting. Anyone suffering from scruples should be directed to read the chapter, *Confession and Me*. The scrupulous one will be amused, even if only wryly: "According to my logic, everything was up to *me* (leave nothing to the mercy of God or the brightness of the priest—too risky) and I began on Wednesday to prepare my essay for Saturday. And beautiful essays they were, too. It was a shame that the priest never had the pleasure of actually hearing one of them. What *he* heard when the slide went up was a halting, gasping, sweating, thrashing recitation . . ." The author then regrets, in such moments, that she does not measure up to the ideal penitent, obeying the injunction: "Be blunt, be brief, be gone".

Enough has been said to show that it is a book only to be enjoyed by Catholics, new or old. Mrs. Hasley is a convert with a deep appreciation of her Faith.

M.O.

# Homiletics

## THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.

A wealthy man about to set out on a long journey summoned three of his servants and entrusted to each of them a large sum of money, to be invested profitably on his behalf during his absence. To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to the third one talent. Being a kind and just master, he did not give the same amount to each one, but distributed the responsibility according to the ability of each servant. He then set out on his journey. Immediately after the departure of the master, the servant who had received the five talents went and traded with his talents, and succeeded in gaining another five talents. Likewise, the servant who received the two talents successfully invested them and doubled his capital. The third servant, however, simply buried the talent he had received and made no effort to put it to profitable use.

The Master returned after a long absence and required of his servants an account of their use of his money. The first and second servants informed their master that they had by their diligence doubled the value of the money entrusted to them. The master was pleased with their conduct, commended them for their fidelity to him, and as a reward not only allowed them to retain the money they had received and gained, but heaped even greater benefits on them: 'thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things: enter into the joy of thy lord'. We may notice here that the reward given to each of these servants was the same, even though one had gained five talents and the other two. Each had used his talents to the best of his ability, each had doubled the value of the money entrusted to him, each was equally diligent and faithful in the service of his master, so each received a similar reward. We shall be required to answer to God only for what we have received. There may be others who have accomplished greater things than we; it is not the brilliance of the result achieved that shall determine the reward, but the diligence and zeal with which we labour. 'To whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: and to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more'. How much unhappiness, discontent, even jealousy might be avoided did men better appreciate this truth?

The third servant appeared before the master to return the one talent which he had received. His attitude was defiant and insolent. He

accused his master of being hard and unjust, of reaping where he had not sown, and so, he continued, 'being afraid I went and hid thy talent in the earth; behold here thou hast what is thine'. The charge of harshness and injustice was certainly not true. The very fact that the master entrusted the money to his servants in the first place is proof of the confidence he had in them, and then the liberality with which he rewarded the two other servants who were faithful exonerates him from any charge of being avaricious or unjust. The fear of the third servant was merely a cloak to conceal his laziness. He merited to be called a 'wicked and slothful servant'. If he were genuinely afraid of losing any part of his master's money, because of his inability to handle it properly he might very easily have handed it over to the bankers and they would have used it and returned it to him, with interest added, when he needed it. But he was too lazy even for that. The master, therefore, orders the talent to be taken from him and given to the servant who has ten talents, and the unprofitable servant he casts out into the exterior darkness.

God is our Master, He is generous and kind. Our dependence upon Him is complete, whatever we have we have received from Him, 'what hast thou that thou hast not received?' asks St. Paul. Gifts both natural and supernatural flow freely from His hands. At the same time, Our Divine Lord warns us in the parable of the talents, that we shall be required to render an account to God of all the gifts we have received from Him. We must, according to our ability, be zealous and diligent in the use of these gifts. It will not suffice to return to God the gifts He has given, we must use them profitably in the interests of our Heavenly Master. The servant in the parable was judged wicked and unprofitable, not because he misused the talent he had received, but because he made no effort to use it at all. The gifts of God bring with them the obligation to be used in accord with His wishes, for His glory and in His service. The service of God means something more than avoiding sin, we must exert ourselves to love God and to love our neighbour for the love of Him. Divine grace will always be available to us to assist us in the performance of our duties, it remains for us to co-operate with those graces if we would obtain the reward promised us by God.

P. L. MURPHY.

## Notes

Some thirty years ago the German historian, Heinrich Boehmer, estimated there were some 200 biographies of Luther in Latin, German, French, English, Danish, Swedish, Italian, Spanish, Russian, Polish, and Lettish.<sup>1</sup> There are many more now.<sup>2</sup> Two hundred lives, two hundred Luthers, as each one presented a different picture. The development of Lutheran studies has been very marked in the last fifty years. Before 1900, the debate waxed hot, because Luther was a man of high importance, and a man, too, who lived his life, as it were, in a glass house. Six quarto volumes of the Weimar edition are necessary to contain the *Tabletalk* of the Reformer, who loved after the day's work to entertain his young companions at table with *bon mots* drawn from his curiously mixed, spiritual and gross, character, which was always exuberant. Two views were possible. One, the way of Melancthon became that of the orthodox Lutheran writers, was to see Luther, the religious genius, who brought the children of God back from

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Boehmer, *Luther and the Reformation in the light of modern research*, London, 1930, p. 5. Boehmer's intelligent, bitter book is an attempt to drive back Denifle. Professor J. P. Whitney's invaluable essay on 'Luther Literature' is to be found in his *Reformation Essays*, London, 1939, pp. 91-104.

<sup>2</sup>Denifle and Grisar are works well known indeed, and which are fundamental in the study of Luther. H. Grisar, S.J., *Luther*, London, 1913-1917, in six volumes, has become a classic. To confine our attention to but a few of the modern books, beyond Boehmer, mention should be made of the very suggestive book by L. Febvre, *Un destin : Martin Luther*, Paris, 1945 (2nd edition). This is the work of a brilliant Protestant writer, who makes a valuable attempt to grasp the real Luther. The 3rd edition of this book has been just published. Current in the bookshops at the present time is the very clever and disarming attempt of the American Yale professor, R. Bainton, to present a 'religious' Luther in his book, *Here I stand : A Life of Martin Luther*, London, 1951 (407 pp., with over 100 illustrations); Gordon Rupp's recent book, *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms*, London, 1951, shows the modern interest in the 'young Luther'. In France, E. de Moreau, the Belgian Jesuit, has written an interesting account of Luther for Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. XVI, pp. 7 to 163; while in Germany the Catholic Lortz, *Reformation in Deutschland*, Frieberg-in-B., 2 vols., 1939-40, has won the applause of Protestants as a pacific attempt to see Luther in his historical setting; careful works are those of the Protestants P. Smith, *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, London, 1911, and J. MacKinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, 4 vols., London, 1925-30; Funck-Brentano is dashing, but unsound in his *Luther*, Paris, 1934; J. Maritain is provocative in *Three Reformers*, London, 1944; P. Wiener, *Martin Luther*, London, n.d., is a curiosity, in which Luther is made the spiritual father of Hitler. Two old books are gems: Melancthon's *Vita Lutheri* (1546) and Cochlaeus's *Acta et Scripta M. Lutheri* (1549), in which Luther is said to be the result of a monstrous union between the devil and Luther's mother!

the Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy; the other, the way of Cochlaeus and many a Catholic battler was to portray the impure, coarse, drunken, devil-possessed Luther, whose inner vileness spluttered forth in the *Tabletalk*. In the last fifty years, attempts have been made to understand the motives of this Titanic son of Germany. In 1904, Father Denifle, O.P., threw an atomic bomb into the opposing ranks, whose radiations are still effective. In particular, he concentrated attention upon the young Luther—the Luther of the years 1505 to 1517. Ficker, the Lutheran scholar, had drawn attention to the existence in the Vatican Library of a copy of Luther's lectures given at Wittenberg in 1515-1516 on the *Epistle to the Romans*. Denifle was quick on the scent, and he had before him the best of all witnesses as to why Luther acted in the fashion he did. Ficker then discovered that the original of Luther's lectures was in the Royal Library at Berlin to the confusion of studious Germany. He published these lectures in 1908, and his edition was placed in the Weimar edition of Luther's works. Old standbys, such as Luther's disgust on the Santa Scala, his gorge rising at that mitred mediocrity, Albert of Brandenburg, Tetzl, his drum, chest and clinking coins, had to fade away from the front rank. The old method of taking Luther's life as a whole, picking spicy bits (or pious bits) out of the *Tabletalk* gave way to the study of the evolution of this rich and fascinating character. On July 17, 1505, a young layman, aged 22, crossed the threshold of the Augustinians at Erfurt. The young Master of Arts, Martin Luther, turned his back, as it is said, on the world. His parents and University friends were dismayed at this abrupt change in his life. There was talk of a thunder storm and a sudden vow, but does that not imply that the reserved young man had been meditating upon his religious vocation, and that his vow and determination to enter the religious life were the culmination of long and anxious thoughts about his eternal salvation? It is interesting to note that at a time when Erasmus and the humanists were ridiculing monks and their life, religious spirits such as More, Colet and Luther sought comfort and strength in the sacrifice that religious life demanded. In the upshot, Luther, alone of the three men above, became a monk. He was a subject of value, and quickly, to modern eyes, far too quickly, he was ordained priest in 1507.<sup>3</sup> With a youthful

<sup>3</sup>Naturally he continued his studies after ordination, but Luther's studies appear to have been lacking both in quality and quantity. Boehmer has some interesting pages on Luther's knowledge. *op. cit.*, pp. 155-175. But the cocksure Luther's theological studies do appear to be both narrow and hurried.

lack of tact and with narrowness, he vaunted on that happy day the joys of the monastic life to the disgust of his father, Hans Luther, who, in spite of his anger, had come to see his brilliant son made a priest.<sup>4</sup> His superior, Staupitz, excellent religious and man, watched over his subject with the love of a father, urging him to develop his talents. But the reserved Luther of his student days remained in Brother Martin. The man who had debated within himself, who, in the fear of death, revealed a tortured soul, had become the scrupulous monk. Peace of soul escaped him. Luther all his life remained subject to pessimism, so much so that great theories of his psychic condition have been erected on his fits of depression.<sup>5</sup> He wished always to feel that he was the friend of God; he was abashed at his frequent moral failures. Long afterwards in his *Tabletalk* Luther gave very exaggerated accounts of his fasts and prayers, assuring his young guests, with a loud laugh, no doubt, while his wife circled disapprovingly the table, that if ever a monk should have been saved by monkery, it was he, Dr. Martin Luther! Staupitz gave him good and sound advice to gaze upon his crucified Lord, and, while striving, to trust the merciful Saviour.<sup>6</sup> So life went on. A Saxon monk's scruples were not of world importance. He continued his studies on Peter Lombard and in particular of Gabriel Biel. In 1510-11 he made the famous journey to Rome with a fellow Augustinian. Luther was in Rome about four weeks. It stands to reason that an obscure Saxon monk would in a few weeks' time have had no opportunity of seeing anything important of the happenings in the Rome of Julius II. Hence as a Protestant historian has written the Roman visit is of no importance in Luther's development.<sup>7</sup> Later on, of course, Dr. Martin Luther told innumerable good stories about Rome; in 1511 he was occupied with something more important, Martin

---

<sup>4</sup>Luther was a barbarian. He was not alone in that quality in his age. A good grounding in manners in clerical circles might have, one is tempted to think, saved the world from this tragedy of the Reformation!

<sup>5</sup>Cochlaeus said Luther was the son of the devil. Modern psychiatrists put it in a different form: hypomaniac phases, subject to fits, hallucinations, paranoidic traits, etc. Luther suffered from all manners of diseases, of which he spares us no details. The question of Luther's alcoholism does not concern the young Luther, as Denifle says, to Boehmer's rage, Luther did not begin to drink until 1521!

<sup>6</sup>One great treasure remains to be discovered, the lost correspondence between Staupitz and Luther!

<sup>7</sup>Scheel has well said: "At Rome the Augustinian neither saw nor heard anything extraordinary..." Febvre, who quotes Scheel, says it is time the Protestant historians abandoned the "Rome of the Borgias", as Luther was moved by a crisis in his own soul. *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

Luther himself—his peace of mind and his salvation. After his return from Rome, he began, what Staupitz said was to be his life work, to lecture on the Bible at the new and small University of Wittenberg.<sup>8</sup> He was a fine lecturer, earnest, hard-working and full of fire. His lecture notes on the Psalm have been preserved. They are orthodox and of little value. He was preoccupied with his work, his troubles and the many tasks his superiors put upon him.<sup>9</sup> He must have noted the affair of Mayence and all the talk of the indulgence, yet he wrote not a word about it, neither in 1514, 1515, 1516, nor 1517. Was he one of those anxious people who then bemoaned the state of the church and ardently desired reform? Was he worried, as Erasmus was and the humanists, about the teaching of theology in the schools? That was the old thesis: a Luther seeing the abuses was moved to cry out with his powerful voice. Luther in 1515 and 1516 (the critical years) was not interested in the reform of the Church. His one preoccupation, from 1505, had been the soul of Luther, the salvation of Luther. There rests his great power, his great originality. He had lived his system before he preached it. "No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful minded) gains. This is the way of things; we promote truth by a self-sacrifice". About 1515, came the great revelation. St. Paul paints two mighty frescoes in the opening chapters of the *Epistle to the Romans*, the reign of sin in the proud pagan world and in the Jewish world. The Wittenberg professor had always felt the weight of concupiscence. He read the words: *Justitia Dei in eo revelatur*. *Justitia Dei*, the punishing justice of God, cried Luther, pursues me even when sin seems to reign triumphant—Queen Sin! Then the flash of lightning, the revelation of the real meaning of that terrible word: *Justitia*. The sense and importance of the discovery have almost been lost sight of in the eagerness to fix the place where the great discovery was made. The

---

<sup>8</sup>How strangely it all turned out! Luther remained in Wittenberg all his days as a Scripture professor, living in the former Black Monastery, which was made over to him.

<sup>9</sup>In October, 1516, he wrote to a friend: .... "I am a conventual preacher, reader at meals, parochial preacher, director of studies, overseer of eleven monasteries, superintendent of the fish pond at Litzkau...lecturer on Paul... I rarely have full time for the canonical hours and for saying Mass, not to mention my own temptations with the world, the flesh, and the devil. You see how lazy I am". (Quoted by Bainton, *op. cit.*, p. 69.) Luther by nature was a born exaggerator—so it is unwise to take him at his face value in anything he says or writes.

ever open and voluble Luther<sup>10</sup> said on one occasion it happened in the *secretus locus monachorum*—behold, Catholicism triumphant! His second version: *Cum semel in hac turri et hypocausto specularer*—behold, Lutheranism saved! And there is a third version in which the word, *Cloaca*, is used! The debate continues. In a quiet lecture hall of Wittenberg the small body of students must have felt the full energy of the dynamic Luther, sure of himself, burning to communicate his new vision of Paul to his hearers; this mighty master of language and images had found himself. We have Cranach's portrait of the Augustinian of 1520, but four years from this time. He is extremely thin, the mouth powerful, the eyes strained and deep set. One can almost hear the voice issuing from those lips. Love is the note we must press if we are to understand God's dealing with men. Paul says all men are sinners: I know it. God in his infinite mercy decides not to notice these defects in his faithful children. Faithful! We are justified by faith alone!<sup>11</sup> And concupiscence? It is invincible because it is original sin. "We are in the position of a sick man full of confidence in his doctor's promise that he will be cured. . . . The sick man, is he cured? No, but he is sick and saved at the same time. He is still actually sick, but due to the formal promise of his doctor he can be considered as saved". Thus we are: "Revera peccatores, sed reputatione miserentis Dei iusti; ignoranter iusti et scienter iniusti; peccatores in re, iusti autem in spe. . . non iustificati, sed iustificandi". Luther, when he took up a book, read his own thoughts in it. Hence he dismissed the scholastics as fools and *sawtheologen* because they had missed the point; alone he excuses Augustine and Ambrose. Luther had found relief, he had found confidence; everywhere in Scripture he saw his idea confirmed. His students, Bernhardi and Fr. Gunther, presented under his direction theses which embodied the new teaching; Gunther, in fact, presented 97 theses in Sept., 1517. Yet there was not a ripple on the theological lake. A man was then living who appeared to have a monopoly of reform—Erasmus. In that field Erasmus was first, daylight second. Luther was a *homo obscurissimus*. Then an event occurred—the affair of the indulgence. With this we leave the tortured soul of Luther to return to the world of hard realities. We know far more of this affair than

---

<sup>10</sup>Yes, says Boehmer gloomily, you will never read Loyola's *Tabletalk* at the Roman College!

<sup>11</sup>Alone! It must be Scriptural, said Luther. The sense demands *sola*; therefore it is part of Scripture!

Luther did, or indeed cared to know, owing to the labours of Schulte in 1904. In 1513 Albert of Brandenburg, younger brother of the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, was elected archbishop of Magdeburg and administrator of Halberstadt.<sup>12</sup> He was 24. On February 9, 1514, the archbishop of Mayence died, to the disgust of the diocese which had seen three archbishops die in the last decade. And every election meant the heavy Roman tax! On March 7, 1514, Albert proposed his candidature to the Chapter of Mayence. Mayence was an electoral See; hence the Hohenzollern family would have two votes in the Electoral College of seven, if Albert gained Mayence. A hint seems to have been given to the Chapter that if a certain candidate were elected, the diocese would not have to bear the tax. On March 9, 1514, Albert was Archbishop of Mayence. Magdeburg and Mayence were two magnificent sees for a young man of 25! On August 18, 1514, the election was confirmed at Rome, after some dispute, the tax being 24,000 ducats. Jacob Fugger the Rich, banker of Augsburg, who specialised in curial and imperial business, advanced the money.<sup>13</sup> As has been remarked above, there was not the slightest reaction from Luther at this unheard of accumulation. Now the young Archbishop was in debt to the Fuggers for an immense sum. It used to be held that Albert approached the Curia in this delicate matter, but it has now been shown that it was the Curia which made the advance. The proposal was this: if the indulgence for the new St. Peter's were preached in the Hohenzollern domains, the money received was to be divided into two parts, half going to St. Peter's, the other to Albert, who could hand it on to the Fuggers to discharge his debt.<sup>14</sup> The Emperor Maximilian got wind of the affair, and as he was the Penniless, he wanted a triple division! He was given 1000 florins as a first and last payment. A veteran of such indulgence preaching was called upon, John Tetzel, O.P. He was slow at getting to work, and it was not until the end of October, 1517, that his preach-

---

<sup>12</sup>Albert of Brandenburg (1490-1545) was created cardinal in 1518. The Fugger debt was round his neck until his death. His portrait by Cranach, with its arrogant face and clumsy hands loaded with twelve rings, would frighten you. For a time it appeared he might turn Lutheran. But he did better in his last years. He died poor and neglected by all. The coming imperial election no doubt explains the cardinal's Hat—*politique d'abord*!

<sup>13</sup>For the rise of this great Catholic banking family, so symptomatic of the rise of Capitalism, see R. Ehrenberg, *Capital and Finance in the Age of the Renaissance*, London, 1928, pp. 64-132.

<sup>14</sup>A representative of the Fuggers was to accompany the indulgence preachers to do the necessary bookkeeping.

ing was talked about in Wittenberg.<sup>15</sup> Luther reacted violently, not so much at the somewhat commercial aspect of the affair, but the doctrine. If man is totally corrupt, what right is there to tell people if they do certain pious acts, repent and confess, they are free from sin? The Wittenberg professor in academic fury wrote down 95 theses against indulgences, rather 95 theses to prove his theory of justification. At midday on October 31, 1517, as he tells us, the theologian left the monastery of the Black Augustinians, walked that autumn day to the side-door of the Castle Church, where he hammered up his theses—it was the customary place for such academic notices.<sup>16</sup> “What Karl Barth said of his own unexpected emergence as a reformer could be said equally of Luther, that he was like a man climbing in the darkness a winding staircase in the steeple of an ancient cathedral. In the blackness he reached out to steady himself, and his hand laid hold of a rope. He was startled to hear the clanging of a bell”. The *homo obscurissimus* had become a mirror-man, in whom Germany saw itself and its aspirations.<sup>17</sup> Luther would no doubt have laughed at you, if you had stopped him on that afternoon of October 31, and told him that he was starting with grace and sin, he would end by denying the Pope, the Councils, the Mass, the Church, the Sacraments, that he would divide Europeans henceforth into two camps, that instead of reforming theology on one point, he would split the Church asunder, that he would end up living in the monastery of the Black Augustinians all by himself, except for his wife, children and paying guests. It was all in the frightening future, for Luther, as for all of us. And it is another story. If only Seripando could have met Luther that afternoon and explained to him the theory of Double Justification! Seemingly he met no one, and we can imagine some Wittenberg gaffers watching Luther hammer up his paper, saying to one another: “More theses?”

T. VEECH.

---

<sup>15</sup>Tetzel would not have come to Wittenberg itself. The Elector of Saxony was not concerned with the plight of Albert, and, moreover, he was a collector of relics himself.

<sup>16</sup>The Elector of Saxony had gathered in the Castle Church relics, which were richly indulgenced (1, 902, 202 years!). These indulgences could be gained on the following day, November 1st. Perhaps this fact, together with Tetzel, stirred Luther. J. Huizinga, in his book *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, London, 1948, gives some curious examples of this extreme love of relics, which was a sign of a material religion.

<sup>17</sup>‘There has never been a German’, wrote Doellinger, ‘who so completely understood, nay whose spirit I should say has been so completely imbibed by his nation...The mind and spirit of the Germans were under his control, like the lyre in the hands of a musician’. (Quoted by C. V. Wedgwood, *Velvet Studies*, London, 1949, p. 65). Febvre (*op. cit.*, pp. 71-86) has a most telling chapter on Germany in 1517.

## Book Reviews

MORAL AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY, A SUMMARY. Rev. Henry Davis, S.J. XXX and 486pp. Sheed and Ward. 30/- (in England).

Shortly after the news of the death of Father Davis at the advanced age of 85, comes this remarkable production which contains the fruit of a life time of experience. His four-volume work, the fifth edition of which was published in 1946 and reviewed in these pages, has long been a safe source of information on pastoral as well as moral problems to the clergy, who will welcome this last contribution to their books of reference. It is not a pocket edition of the former publication, for the author tells us in the Preface: "it seemed better to err on the side of completeness than of brevity, and to aim at the mean between the full treatises and a bald statement of detached propositions". The principles are all there, set out briefly and clearly, and illustrated where necessary by examples. We may instance the two and a half pages (pp. 8-10) on Systems of Moral Action. He records the four main systems: Probabilism, Equiprobabilism, Probabiliorism and Compensationism; and gives in a few lines the fundamental reason for each system—v.g. for Probabilism: "when it is a question only of licit action, if the law is doubtful, liberty is in possession". To show how each of these systems are applied, he takes the example of a man who has made a vow, has good reasons for thinking that he has fulfilled it, and at the same time good (perhaps better) reasons for thinking he has not fulfilled it. How would his doubt be solved according to each of the systems? Fr. Davis gives the various answers; and then in a final section has some practical remarks on Probabilism in practice.

The work is quite up to date. It contains instruction for the administration of the sacrament of Confirmation by a Priest; treats of the abolition of the exemption from the form of Marriage enjoyed before 1949 by children of non-Catholics who, though baptised in infancy as Catholics were brought up outside the Catholic Church; and in Appendix on pp. 53, 54, we have two replies of the Holy Office (July 1st and August 11th, 1949) on Communism and assistance at the Marriages of communists. Modern medical problems are briefly discussed. On the question of Prefrontal Leukotomy or Lobotomy (pp. 67-68), after telling us in a few words what the operation is and that it has been moder-

ately successful with persons suffering from various mental aberrations he continues. "The operation is done only when all other methods of medical treatment have failed, and when otherwise the prospects of recovery are practically non-existent. The danger of the operation is that it may interfere with the rational life of the patient. Nevertheless it does often save life, and provided that permission is obtained from the patient and those who are responsible for him, it appears justifiable to give him a further lease of life, no worse, perhaps better than his present state. More clinical experience than is at present available is necessary before one can pronounce in its favour". Most will agree with his statement on total war: "The contention that in total war, as it is called, the death of all and sundry, including infants, the sick, the infirm... may be directly intended, is a contention that would justify wholesale murder of the innocent". The paragraph concludes with a sane statement on the atomic bomb: "The use of the atomic bomb, even in a just war, is condemned on moral grounds, because its deadly effects on innocent people are usually out of all proportion to the destruction it causes to legitimate military targets".

What has been written will show in a small way how valuable is this Summary as a convenient book of reference. The author himself warns us: "it is not meant for beginners, for no one can learn a science from a summary". It is a matter for deep regret that the hand that wrote this excellent work can no longer wield the pen. The many priests who owe him a debt will not forget a Memento for the repose of his soul.

J.M.

\*

\*

\*

\*

QUAESTIONES SELECTAE EX EPISTOLIS S. PAULI, by P.

F. Ceuppens, O.P., Marietti, Rome and Turin, pp. IX + 214.

Theology and Scripture students are deeply indebted to Fr. Ceuppens of the Angelicum, Rome, for the excellent series of publications on Biblical Theology that have come out under his name. His *De Deo Uno* (2nd ed.), *De Sanctissima Trinitate* (2nd ed.), *De Incarnatione* (2nd ed.), *De Mariologia Biblica*, as well as *Quaestiones selectae ex Historia Primaeva* (cf. A.C.R., 1949, pp. 360-361), have already appeared, and have justly been acclaimed.

His most recent work is given over to a presentation of some fundamental points of Pauline Theology in the light of a scientific and clear

examination and exposition of a number of more important and difficult texts of the Apostle's epistles. After an introductory chapter about the life and writings of St. Paul, our author gives a satisfying and thorough treatment of the Knowability of God (Rom. I, 18-23), Justification through Faith (Rom. 3, 21-30), Original Sin (5, 12-21), Predestination to glory "ante praevisa merita" (8, 28-30). This section on the Romans is enriched by an Appendix on Polygenism in the light of Genesis and the Romans.

From the Corinthians, the Eucharist (I Cor., 11, 17-34), the Hymn of Charity (12, 3-6-13, 13), and the famous Resurrection passage (15, 1-58) are considered at length. The dogmatic section of "the grandest of all the Pauline letters", the Ephesians (1, 3-3, 21) wherein, with rare insight and feeling, the Apostle expounds the nature of the mystery of our unity in Christ, is dealt with in full, it is followed by the Christological passages of the Colossians (1, 14-15; 2, 9), and the Philippians (2, 6-11). The Eternal Priesthood of Christ, the subject matter of the Hebrews, 5, 1-10; 7, 1-28, complete this valuable publication.

H.G.D.

\*

\*

\*

\*

ON DARLINGHURST HILL, by John O'Brien. Produced for Monsignor Wallace by Ure Smith Pty. Ltd., Sydney, 1952, 96 pp. Illus. 12/6.

Taylor Square on a hot Saturday morning! Panting crowds of sportsmen rushing to their weekly business and pleasure, flanked by the grim, if salutary warnings of old Darlinghurst jail, a large funeral parlour, which conducts up Oxford St. the more sensational and restless of Sydney's sons and daughters, and the large brick tower of the Sacred Heart Church. Just a place to get through with its reminders! Picturesque? Only safely on a Sali Herman canvas. Well as everybody (literally) knows a certain poetic hand has touched the scene, and it turns before our eyes into a Stretton pastoral.

It is nice for a reviewer to feel that he has not to advise his readers to buy a book, because if you have not your copy of *On Darlinghurst Hill* you will miss having the first edition, and will have to be content with the mere later editions. John O'Brien has given us in this very elegant little book an exact and entrancing account of the first hundred years of the Sacred Heart Church and parish of Darlinghurst—its beginnings amid the gum trees and wild flowers, the early priests, the

growth of the district. How well he does it! John O'Brien sees always the growth of the parish in relation to the Darlinghurst world around him, and he makes the richest use of that frantic and lurid scene; he has a wonderful love of, and sympathy with, human nature in all its forms; he is a born story teller who can etch a character so vividly in a paragraph that it lives and breathes; in other words, he is an artist. So he has brought a century to life and painted a choice little gallery of characters who jostle one another as they have always done in Taylor Square—dear old Dr. Polding driving in the Weddin Mountains trying to help Ben Hall and his gang (one of whom Johnny Dunn saw his last sun rise on Darlinghurst hill); Green the hangman—a macabre study which Dickens and Balzac would have said was good, hot stuff; the Belgian priest's quaint ideas on dancing (which will win that cleric a fame he hardly dreamt of!); bushrangers, priests, hangmen, saints, and sinners—a slice of life, piping hot, as hot as Taylor Square at noon on Saturdays. And for a hundred years the gospel of Our Lord has been preached by devoted priests, Mass has been celebrated, the children taught, the sick and dying tended, and hosts of Sydney people have seen the light of day at St. Margaret's on Darlinghurst Hill. It is good to know we have all these pictures locked up in this little book, and that in A.D. 2052 Mgr. Carroll's hat, whose model was scrapped by the manufacturers 'when he, their last patron, closed his account', and the curate who threw Dr. Polding's bed out of the window and all the good people of Darlinghurst will not only be not forgotten, but most vigorously alive. Monsignor Wallace has aided and abetted in the production of this book. He, the present parish priest, has seen to it that the paper, illustrations, and printing were just right. Surely this pair, who display such smooth combination, must have some more tricks up their joint sleeve!

T.V.

\*

\*

\*

\*

THE QUEEN'S DAUGHTERS: A Study of Women Saints, by C. Martindale, S.J. (Sheed & Ward, 1951). 12/6 stg. 200 p.p.

In an introduction to this book the author explains that, having published his book, *What are Saints?*, he hoped to follow it up by a book on women-saints. He evidently hoped to give the chapters as broadcast talks, thus following the same course as with his book on men-saints. But with two or three exceptions, the lives of women-saints were so restricted until last century—that is, in the matter of exterior

works—that the broadcast talks were never given. The book that was produced is in no sense comparable to *What are Saints?*, which is a little masterpiece of hagiography.

*The Queen's Daughters* must have involved the author in extensive reading along obscure paths of literature and history, and it is remarkable in its comprehensive view of the growth of Christian culture. The framework into which he fits the short sketches may be appreciated from the titles of the chapters: The Church in the Pagan Empire, The Empire becomes Christian, The Church looks West and North, The Light of mediaeval Mysticism, The Break-up of Christendom. . . . and so down to our own day. Many pages become so compressed as to read like a catalogue—but even a catalogue sparkles if it is Fr. Martindale's; and at least it will send thoughtful readers to a library to find out more about the heroic women whom he so heartily admires.

But as the small book threatened to become so crowded, it was a wonder the author did not omit many of the names of holy women in Italy and France. Most readers in the English-speaking world (for whom the book was written) will meet them here for the first time—and probably, the last. As very little information is given on them, the space could well have been given to more familiar names. Father Martindale evidently felt that such criticism would be made. But what an astonishing omission is that trio of Irish heroines; Nano Nagle, Catherine McCauley, and Mary Aikenhead. That over-sight will disappoint many readers in Australia—not to speak of other English-speaking countries.

It is in seventeenth-century France, or rather France in any century, that the author seems to wander with most pleasure. And how well he does write about her daughters! He is delighted, and so are we, at the thought of the *grande dame* in religious dress in the cloister, trying to adapt herself to religious customs. As server in the refectory she sweeps such a curtsy that the food slides off the dish. . . . Then, far removed from courtly etiquette, we have glimpses of those noble servants of God: Jeanne Jugan, M-Victoire Couderc, and a score of others. Perhaps, after all, even sanctity has been superlatively well done in France.

The page or so on Cornelia Connelly, the foundress of the nuns of the Holy Child, should send readers to the full life of that remarkable woman. Mary Ward is the only English woman given more than a mention. She is put first among those treated in the section, The Modern World; and the few pages devoted to her heroic work will send

many readers in quest of a good book on her life. The same may be said of the pages devoted to our Australian heroine, Mary McKillop.  
M.O.

\*

\*

\*

\*

THEOLOGIA BIBLICA : Vol. III. DE INCARNATIONE. P.

F. Ceuppens, O.P. Marietti: pgs. 241.

Any series of text-books, which intends to supply the wants of seminaries, is of necessity limited in space, and it is usually the scriptural and patristic sections that suffer. The speculative part, after all, is harder to grasp and needs more elaborate presentation. No doubt this fact influenced Fr. Ceuppens when he began his series on biblical theology "for the use of theologians, both professors and students". Certainly it adds enormously to its value. The priest or student with little time for searching large commentaries has now, easy of attainment, a scholarly treatment of the scriptural sources of dogmatic truth.

This third volume, *De Incarnatione*, lives up to the high standard of its predecessors. Returning to his original plan, after the different arrangement in *De Sanctissima Trinitate* caused by peculiarities of the subject, the author sets out to cover his ground along the lines followed in the *Summa Theologiae*. It is purely a working method. Many of the saint's articles are speculative and these are left untouched. The conclusions reached have no special reliance on St. Thomas' authority. He is cited several times, but only because of his arguments. This freedom from any influence but the evidence at hand is the outstanding quality of the work.

Love, loyalty, pride, all tend to make us squeeze everything possible from scripture to support the faith, but Fr. Ceuppens never gives in to this temptation. He quotes the councils occasionally, but then proceeds to exegesis as though the councils had never existed. Each text, as it comes under review, is put clearly in its context, its meaning considered with help from every instrument of modern exegesis, and a conclusion drawn. And he is careful to qualify his conclusions, to note when an argument is conclusive or merely some foundation found for an opinion.

The aim of the book is not only to prove the faith but also to examine all the texts commonly used for this purpose, and in this it is of particular value to students of all kinds. Fr. Ceuppens never accepts or rejects without discussion and spends, for example, over eight pages in deciding against scriptural backing for a second motive, other than

man's redemption, for the Incarnation. In the early section dealing with Christ's divinity, the treatment is shorter as the matter already occupies great space in the second volume of the series. Especially lengthy treatment is given to objections against the infallibility of Christ's human knowledge and to Christ's priesthood. The latter section is of great interest to-day. When so much thought is being given to Christ as priest and mediator, it is good to have its basis in revelation accurately defined. Besides, the scriptures are so rich on this subject that the whole passage is stimulating reading.

But there is little point in singling sections out for praise. All is well and carefully treated. There is no constant reference to adversaries, but their arguments, when they have force, are given sound consideration. It is good to see the opponent is not left as a mere name in the text, but the relevant work and page-number are always given in a foot-note. As in the other volumes, there is a useful reference apparatus: analytical index, recording both section and corresponding article of the Summa, separate indices for subjects and authors, and a biblical index. This last is imperfect, in that there is no way of telling from it whether a reference is to a detailed commentary on the text, or merely to a citation in support of some remark. There is no formal bibliography, but the claim made in the first volume, that the footnotes give a bibliography for each section, is justified here also.

B.J.

\*

\*

\*

\*

SURRENDER TO THE SPIRIT, by Eileen Surles, R.C. Kenedy & Sons. 242 pages.

Marie-Thérèse Couderc, Foundress of the Religious of Our Lady of the Cenacle, is the subject of this interesting biography, set against the indifference or the hostility of the first eighty years of 19th century France. France has taken a long time to recover from the spiritual blight of the 18th century that culminated in the Revolution.

Readers may remember a short account of Mother Couderc, written by Fr. Martindale in the *Household of God* series for the volume, *The King's Daughters*. One of her own congregation has now given us a full and carefully written life. The spiritual title and tone of the book are well suited to the heroic woman by whose tomb at La Louvesc crowds of pilgrims offer prayers, hoping that her sanctity will be proclaimed by the Church. She was born in 1805 and died in 1885, leaving a religious society firmly established. In the years immediately

following her death, requests for foundations poured in, and houses were opened in England, Belgium, Holland, and America.

Like every Foundress, her life was a working out of the conditions for success laid down by our Lord: "Unless the grain of wheat falling into the ground die . . ." Her biographer says well: "Mother Thérèse reached the heights of self-surrender because she grasped the message of the Mass. She penetrated the meaning of divine victimhood as it spoke from the silence of the Altar". But this high destiny was hidden from the young peasant girl, Marie-Victoire Couderc, as she sat in the front row in a village church listening intently to the inspired and inspiring instructions of a priest giving a mission. He was Father Terme, whose life, we are pleased to note, has been written at least in French.

Marie-Victoire was twenty-one, tolerably well educated for a girl in her milieu, but already marked for sanctity by her persistent longing to give herself completely to God's service in a Religious Order. But where? An interview with the holy priest decided that: "Would you like to teach catechism? I know a group of women at Aps who teach the children in the parishes. They do not have vows yet, but some day they will". Good, heroic Father Terme. God put many good works under his hand, and one of the best was his training of the girl whom he led into the Religious life under the name of Marie-Thérèse.

The Cenacle nuns, as they are often spoken of to-day, seem to have kept to the work which called their society into being: the managing of enclosed retreats for women. It sounds, and is, a very dignified and orderly business; but the early Mothers at La Louvesc must have gritted their teeth as their first retreatants tramped up the bare stairs of the convent and threw themselves and their bits of luggage around the place. We may say, in excusing these noisy peasants, that they did not know they were the first of an honourable line of retreatants. They were really out on a trip, a pilgrimage, if you will, to the shrine of St. Regis. It made a nice outing, especially now that Father Terme had arranged for free beds and meals at this new hostel. We are now in the old story of humble beginnings.

Because of its connection with the shine of St. Regis, the Cenacle nuns were very soon under the guidance of the Jesuit Fathers, whose direction was of value in the work of retreats. The first nuns were simple peasants who were in great need of spiritual instruction and formation. As years passed and the work prospered and spread,

it attracted many well-educated and well-bred ladies. Good Mother Thérèse was venerated by all. But that seems the first course only in the making of a saint. The esteem has to go, to return only when the soul is unaware of it, so deeply has it become established in God's love.

M.O.

\*

\*

\*

\*

SYNTHESIS OF SACRIFICE ACCORDING TO SAINT AUGUSTINE, by Arthur F. Krueger. *Dissertatio ad Lauream*—Pontificia Facultas Theologica Seminarii Sanctae Mariae ad Lacum, Mundelein, Illinois, U.S.A. 171 pages.

This is the 19th of the series of valuable dissertations issued by this seminary during the last few years. The author sets out to study St. Augustine's notion of sacrifice as the key-concept of his sacrificial theology. He traces it through many branches of the saint's writings, his chapter headings giving a clear indication of the scope of his work: Sacrifice in General; Ancient Sacraments of Jesus Christ; Christ's Bloody Sacrifice—Sacrament of the Destruction of Sin; The Mass—Sacrifice of Christ and of the Mystical Christ. This is a broad programme, and that fact produces both the value and the weakness of the dissertation.

Fr. Krueger succeeds in working out a synthesis from St. Augustine's very numerous and scattered references to the notion of sacrifice, and his treatment brings home very forcibly the value of such studies, leaves the reader in no doubt of the riches to be found, and illuminates many questions that are treated in an enforcedly brief manner in the textbooks—for example, the interesting and actual question of the priesthood of the laity. This is the strength of the dissertation. But the very fact that it is forced to cover so much ground makes it rather unsatisfying in some sections. Here and there, there is too much summarising, too little actual quotation, and the reader is, therefore, too frequently left to wonder just what were St. Augustine's actual words. However, the references are well done, and provide an adequate introduction to a more detailed study of the various subjects treated.

Some of the conclusions are interesting. In the disputed question about the nature of sacrifice, Fr. Krueger puts St. Augustine on the side of those who consider immolation as essential to sacrifice; he builds up the following physical definition of sacrifice—of course, St. Augustine gives no such definition—"a sacrifice is the offering of a visible gift

which, being immolated, aptly symbolizes interior sentiments of man's submission to and union with God, his final end". In discussing the essence of the Mass, he decides that St. Augustine arrived at a position "quite similar . . . to the one scientifically developed in recent years by Billot". The author is not afraid to make up his mind, and, as in these matters, he is similarly definite on other important topics.

W.S.

\*

\*

\*

\*

THE CONVENT MIRROR—Conferences for Religious. By the Very Rev. F. T. Hoeger, C.S.S. (Pustet, 1951, 246 pp., \$3.00).

The only fault this book has is its title and cover—the publisher's fault, we presume. The blue dust cover with the nun's face, worked up to a Rossetti-model pout, will attract seculars who have no business at all with the contents. Australian Religious will probably leave it unopened, for even the gayest of us like our conferences in sober livery; and we do hate them to be available to seculars.

The author, an experienced and thoughtful priest, has written it for Religious—both men and women. There is nothing piquant about the contents or style; it is a very solid—some might say, stolid—book. In nearly every chapter there is a short passage from Canon Law to reinforce the dominant theme of the sacredness of Religious vows and constitutions. Having been a Master of Novices and a Professor of Theology, the author is at home with his subject; and, as he is a member of the deeply respected Holy Ghost Fathers, religious readers will receive much profit from these conferences with their practical lessons.

In the chapter headed, Where Do We Go From Here, there is a quotation from the letter of Pope Pius XI addressed to the heads of religious communities in 1924: "We exhort religious, if they desire to receive with certainty a plentiful share of the graces of their vocation, to model their lives on the example set for each by their founder, who prescribed the laws that govern the Institute". Later in the same chapter the author shows how deviations lead to abuses, giving an example of the way in which the religious spirit may be weakened by over-friendly intercourse with seculars. Fr. Hoeger writes: "American religious have a wholesome spirit of hospitality and cordiality. But this may however unintentionally allow lay friends to take liberties in religious houses. A generous layman burst into the dining room of a men's community some time ago, and shouted out his greetings over the voice of

the reader. He acted under the impulse of a habit which he had acquired in some religious house—an impulse to go wherever he pleased in the house”.

We may smile at this exotic ebullience, murmuring that it could only happen where it happened. But there are other matters of which Australians may say: It could happen here. One such important point is the temptation with which American religious superiors are often confronted: the acceptance of favours through the hands of politicians. Fr. Hoeger speaks strongly on the sin of injustice which may thus be committed if such acceptance means a wrongful use of taxpayers' money.

The last chapter, *Restlessness*, is full of sane encouragement based on the advice of Ven. Fr. Libermann, C.S.Sp., given with his dying breath: “Be fervent, always fervent. And above all, charity; charity, above all....charity in the name of Jesus Christ...Sacrifice yourself for Jesus....” Religious of every temperament may safely ponder on this advice and on Fr. Hoeger's commentary. We may let our little skiff enjoy any breeze, if we are anchored in fervour, charity and sacrifice.

M.O.

\*

\*

\*

\*

THE CATHOLIC DOCTOR, by Rev. A. Bonnar, O.F.M., D.D. (5th edition). Burns, Oates, pgs. 179, price 10/6.

Medical ethics is a vast subject, as wide and as complicated as modern medicine itself. To cover it completely would be to write a large book, useful to the moral theologian perhaps, but far too unwieldy for the medical man. He has his professional studies to keep up. Fr. Bonnar, in this present work, has attempted a practical handbook rather than an exhaustive study, and aims at usefulness, not completeness.

A glance at the page numbers bears this out. Nobody could examine all the complications of the subject in less than two hundred pages. Still, it is surprising how much has been included. The author has the knack of stating his principles simply and clearly. Once he has them so set down, he usually leaves the reader to master them, and does not bother to press them home by repetition or lengthy discussion. Because of this, it is unlikely any person without training in ethics will find one reading enough to master this work, despite its simplicity. Examples are given, of course, but they are not merely to illustrate the principles. Those situations most commonly found to-day are the only

ones used. The book intends giving a firm foundation of principle, with a practical application to the duties of modern Catholic medical men, and everything is directed to that end.

The realisation that any study must be given its proper relation to other truths, shown throughout in the careful building of practice on principle, comes out also in the general structure. The first chapter attempts a very brief outline of Catholic apologetics and a vindication of the Church's rights, particularly that of legislating for its subjects. Brevity destroys the power of most of the arguments, particularly the apologetical proof, but criticism on these grounds would be unfair. This chapter is not there to prove but to give the reader a true perspective, to show how the laws given draw their force from the solid foundations of the faith. Two more chapters, on miracles and the basis of morality, complete this introductory section.

The body of the book begins with a treatment of scandal and co-operation in evil. It is given point by a discussion of the duties of Catholic hospital authorities and attendants in regard to immoral operations. The four following chapters consider problems of sex and marriage. The doctor is here viewed as adviser as well as practitioner. Not only are medical problems treated but a summary of the mutual obligations of married couples is given. Birth-control and abortion are dealt with at some length. In regard to them, and to a later treatment of euthanasia, the author tempers his usual austerity by references to modern medical and legal opinion. There is also a brief but informative treatment of lesser problems, such as artificial insemination and sterility.

No side of a doctor's practice is forgotten. A chapter on baptism sets out the moral and canon law in some detail, with a discussion of unusual cases. Psycho-analysis is considered and a moderate judgment passed, viz., that it is a licit practical method, though some of its theory is in conflict with the faith. This opinion is not acceptable to at least one Catholic authority. A short treatment of pre-frontal leucotomy shows, at its best, the author's power of combining compression and clarity.

B.J.